

FROM PEACE FRONT TO PEOPLE'S WAR

Edited by
G. Adhikari

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE,
Raj Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road,
BOMBAY 4

Rs. 5/-

335.4
A.235.4

First Edition, November 1942.

Second Enlarged Edition, June 1944.

73155

SLJVO-058527

Printed by Sharaf Athar Ali, New Age Printing Press, 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4, and published by him for People's Publishing House, Raj Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This book is a new, enlarged and up-to-date edition of the booklet *From Peace Front to People's War* published by us in November 1942. The main additions are that instead of giving merely the resolutions on the reports of Dimitrov and Ercoli to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, we are printing the full texts of their reports as well.

In addition we have included the speech of D. Z. Manuilsky on the work of the Seventh Congress and also an important article written by Dimitrov in November 1938.

We have brought the book up-to-date by giving R. Palme Dutt's articles in *Labour Monthly* on the three important landmarks of the last three years—the Anglo-Soviet Agreement, the Moscow Conference and the Teheran Conference.

Thus while this book covers roughly the same field as the previous and smaller edition, it is much more extensive and detailed, and brings the whole story up to December 1943.

C O N T E N T S

INTRODUCTION—By G. Adhikari	1
1. FASCISM AND THE DRIVE TOWARDS A NEW IMPERIALIST WAR—J. Stalin (1934)	9
2. FASCISM AND THE UNITY OF THE WORKING-CLASS—G. Dimitrov (1935)	16
3. THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R. (1935)	142
4. THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR—M. Ercoli (1935)	150
5. THE WORK OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL—D. Z. Manuilsky (1935)	239
6. AFTER THE MUNICH CONSPIRACY—G. Dimitrov (1938)	302
7. THE SOVIET FIGHT FOR PEACE AND AGAINST THE INSTIGATORS OF WAR—J. Stalin (1939)	316
8. THE WAR AND THE WORKING CLASS—G. Dimitrov (1939)	328
9. IMPERIALIST WAR INTO PEOPLE'S WAR—P. C. Joshi (1942)	347
10. A NEW REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE—P. C. Joshi (1942)	361
11. FOR VICTORY OVER HITLER IN 1942—Communist International	377
12. THE TWO CAMPS—J. Stalin (1942)	387
13. THE ANGLO-SOVIET AGREEMENT—R. Palme Dutt (1942)	389
14. THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE—R. Palme Dutt (1943)	398
15. THE TEHERAN CONFERENCE—R. Palme Dutt (1943)	411
APPENDICES :	
THE ANGLO-SOVIET AGREEMENT (1942)	425
THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE	429
CHRONOLOGY	437

INTRODUCTION

To First Edition

We are reprinting in this book a series of historic documents of the Communist movement arranged in a chronological order. These show how the Communist International and its leaders, Stalin and Dimitrov, warned the peoples of the world of the catastrophe that was facing them, how they foresaw it, correctly analysed it and put forward a correct path of action. They uttered this warning and chalked out a correct path of action almost seven to eight years ago. Subsequently history has completely vindicated the analysis they gave and the policy and programme of action they chalked out. The policies which the Communists put forward and practised in the succeeding phases of this final crisis of world imperialism, have at each stage showed the peoples of the world the correct way to regroup their forces and hit out in the most effective way against their main enemy. The results of that policy have every time proved its correctness and have each time advanced the cause of the people as against imperialism. Today again it is the Communist policy alone which shows the peoples of the world the correct path. In every country it is the Communists who are at the head, leading and uniting the people nationally and internationally so that this war is fought and won as a war of liberation, a people's war. In every country it is the Communists alone who have a correct policy of uniting the entire people of their Motherland for winning independence and democratic liberties, for creating a free world, for achieving the final liquidation of World Imperialism.

TWO CAMPS

Today two camps stand facing each other, locked in a grim and mortal combat—the camp of the imperialists who want to impose black fascist slavery on the whole world and the camp of the people, led by the U.S.S.R., which stands for the liberation of every country and people. The fate of entire mankind, of every people depends upon the outcome of this battle. None can today stand outside this battle. All are today faced with one common danger. All have to unite and to strike together against one common enemy. That way lies

liberation for all. Only the utterly blind or the contemptible agents of the fascists will deny this plain truth. Who does not remember the ringing and passionate words in which the Congress President, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad drove home this plain truth? "India's rightful place is in the camp of the people. Only through the victory of this camp can she win her complete freedom"—that was how the Congress President posed the issue, and rightly.

The picture has become confused in the smoke and dust raised by the crisis which was precipitated in our country by the wholesale arrest of leaders on 9th August and the repression that was let loose in the months that followed. But the veil is again lifting. Patriots and people of India are slowly coming to the realisation that their place is in the camp of liberation, headed by the U.S.S.R. and China and by the peoples of America and Britain. In ever-larger numbers, they are turning to the Communists for guidance and leadership. They want to know how this is a peoples' war and why does their liberation lie in the victory of this war. This book would enable Communists and earnest patriots to study how the Communist policy evolved through the past 7 or 8 years. It would also enable them to see how it is the Communists alone who saw in time the coming danger, how they worked against the coming menace, what slogans they put forward in the various phases and how their policy today is the only people's policy.

STALIN'S WARNING OF 1934

What are the various documents reprinted in this book and what is their significance?

The first document is an extract from Stalin's Report to the 17th Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.) made in January 1934. Here Stalin is summing up the features of the new situation which came into existence after Hitler's rise to power in Germany. Sixteen years after the conclusion of the last war, the world was once again heading towards a new war. World imperialism in crisis, which got further intensified in the economic crisis of 1929-33, was seeking to find a way out in a new war and in going over to Fascism—the bloody terroristic rule of finance-capital. Stalin warned: the imperialists will try to light the conflagration of war in various ways, some will try to attack small nations, some will involve the U.S.S.R. in war. The point is to solve their crisis and conflict at the expense of small nations, and of the U.S.S.R. (by grabbing new

territories and markets) and by crushing revolutionary movements in the various countries (Fascism). Stalin pointed out how this could not be a solution. On the contrary it would only further deepen the crisis. It would become a revolutionary crisis, and an attack upon the U.S.S.R. would only become the beginning of the end of the imperialists. But, Stalin also pointed out, all this would not happen automatically. The victory of the revolution would have to be prepared for. The proletariat would have to strengthen their revolutionary parties, Communist Parties, in the various countries, must make them more organised, more determined and skilful. For unless the parties know how to take advantage of the revulsion against fascism and war which is widespread among the people, unless they can unite and lead the people in every country and in the world in such a way as to utilise the crisis, there could be no successful revolution.

SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE C.I.

In the next series of documents, which are the main resolutions passed by the 7th World Congress of the Communist International, this practical, strategical and tactical plan, which the proletarian parties have to follow to utilise the crisis, is laid down in detail. The new menace to the peoples of the world, which is being found in the people's war today, really came into existence in 1934. This is how Comrade Manuilsky summed up the situation:—

"The growing menace of world imperialist war is causing all class, national and state forces to separate into two camps: the camp of war and the camp of peace. The centre of forces which are operating to bring about war, to accelerate its outbreak is *FASCISM*; in Europe the most reactionary and aggressive form of Fascism exists in Hitlerite Germany. In Asia, it is in military-fascist Japan. . . . Germany is now threatening all her neighbours and is striving to achieve hegemony in Europe. Japan, which proclaims that Japanese imperialism has a special mission in Asia is already waging a war in China. Both Germany and Japan turn the spearhead of their aggression against the U.S.S.R. Italy stands fully armed on the frontier of Ethiopia and is trying to strengthen her position in the Mediterranean."

(Manuilsky: Speech delivered before active workers of Moscow Organisation of the C. P. S. U. (B.) on September 14, 1935.)

These words were spoken seven years ago. This is how the Communist International clearly foresaw the fascist imperialists of these three countries menacing the peace, freedom and democracy of the whole world. They represented the *spearhead* of the offensive of World Imperialism against the peoples of the world. When the Communists concentrated their fire on the fascist rulers of these three countries as the incendiaries of war, they were really evolving the most effective strategical plan of delivering a decisive blow against World Imperialism as a whole. Why was this distinction made between the imperialist rulers of Germany, Japan and Italy and the imperialist ruling circles of Britain, France and America?

NAMING THE FASCIST AGGRESSORS

Why was the distinction made between aggressor-powers and the non-aggressor powers? Why did not the Communists say: All imperialist powers are equally responsible for the drive towards war as they did on the eve of the First World War? The answer to this question, which often arises, even today in a new form in the minds of the patriots, was given thus in 1935 by Comrade Manuilsky:

"It is absurd to compare the situation on the outbreak of the world imperialist war in 1914 with the present situation. Today, the U.S.S.R. exists, the land of victorious socialism which has fundamentally changed the direction of imperialist antagonism. Today, the fundamental division of the world, into the world of Socialism and the world of Capitalism, is the main world antagonism. On the other hand, today fascism exists in the most furious form of bourgeois reaction and imperialist aggression which threatens to enslave its own and foreign peoples and which is directed against the U.S.S.R. as the land of victorious socialism.... Today the *Defence of the U.S.S.R.* determines the main line of policy of the world proletariat in relation to war, whereas in 1914 the best proletarian revolutionaries adopted the position of defeat of one's own imperialist government in war. *Today the position of fighting Germany, Japan and Italy as the instigators of World War is a genuinely revolutionary position.*"

(Manuilsky, *Ibid.*)

POLICY OF PEACE FRONT

The Communist International laid bare the fascist conspiracy which World Imperialism was hatching against the peace of the world, against the freedom of the peoples, against the progressive achievements of the working-class movement,

against the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. It put forward a line of counter-offensive, the line of working-class and people's united action against fascism and war, the line of building a Peace Front of democratic countries headed by the Soviet Union against fascist aggressors. Thus while it foretold how the situation developing was one fraught with the gravest peril, it, at the same time, unmasked the deepest crisis which imperialism was undergoing and showed how a great prospect of battles and victories opened up before the working-class movement.

The policy of Peace Front for which Communists sought to rally the people in every country was not just a diplomatic trick to get a series of treaties between the U.S.S.R. and the non-fascist imperialist countries so that this coalition could wage a successful war against the fascist countries if required. Trotskyist-fascists said then that the Communists in fighting for the Peace Front were acting as agents of the Foreign Office of the U.S.S.R. Today fascist agents continue to spread the same slander when they say that Communists are calling this a people's war only because their Soviet Union is attacked. The march of events and men has disproved and isolated these slanderers. The Peace Front movement was sought to be developed as a mighty mobilisation of the peoples in the democratic countries against the imperialist reactionaries in the democratic countries, in Britain, America and France. These reactionaries were seeking to aid and abet the fascist incendiaries in their policy of aggression against small nations, in their provocation against the U.S.S.R. They wanted to encourage the fascists in these countries because they thought this would enable them to kill two birds with one stone, to crush the revolutionary movements in China and Spain and the U.S.S.R. on the one hand, and to weaken the fascist rivals on the other. The Peace Front movement was a revolutionary rallying of the people in a mighty world front to smash this conspiracy. The mutual assistance pacts between the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries would have come about only as a victory of the *PEOPLE* in these countries against imperialist reactionaries. This was clearly shown by the example of the short-lived Franco-Soviet Pact. The pact came about when the French Popular Front Government, based on the working-class and people's unity, beat back the offensive of the French pro-fascist reactionaries. But as soon as Social-Democratic vacillation and betrayal resulted in the weakening of working-

class and people's unity, the pact was blown up. Similarly, the Anglo-Soviet Pact which was being negotiated in March to August, 1939, did not come about because the unity of the British working class and the British people was not strong enough to smash the game which Chamberlain was playing through those negotiations. The Peace Front which the Communists were striving to build corresponded to the interests of every people, not only to those of the U.S.S.R. It would have strengthened the camp of the people as against the camp of the fascist-imperialists. It would have preserved peace and strangled fascism. If the fascist aggressors dared to go to war against the Peace Front they would have had to face a people's war on a worldwide scale and on all fronts from the very start. The fascists would not have dared to launch upon such a suicidal venture.

PEACE FRONT TO PEOPLE'S WAR

The struggle for the Peace Front was a struggle of the camp of the people led by the working class against the camp of imperialism chiefly directed against its spearhead—Fascism. It was as much in the interests of the peoples in the capitalist countries as in those of the colonial countries, as it was in the interests of the U.S.S.R. The Peace Front just because it was a fight for peace, was the fight to rally the support of the peoples of the world behind the people's war which the first victims of fascist aggression like China and Spain were waging. The valiant peoples of these countries were the advance guard who years ahead were fighting the people's war. The Communists then said: China and Spain are fighting not only for their own freedom, but for the freedom of every people. Subsequent events have proved how true these words were. The question then was whether the glorious resistance of the Chinese and the Spanish people was to be supported by the united resistance of the peoples of the world to smash the game of fascist aggressors and their abettors, or whether the fascists were to be allowed to pass over with impunity from these aggressions to an aggression against the peoples of the whole world.

Every one knows how the subsequent events answered the question and how the Peace Front movement failed to materialise. That failure was due to the betrayal of Social-Democracy, the lack of working-class unity and the consequent

failure to build people's unity against the fascist aggressors and their abettors in the democratic countries. Thus came about the betrayal at Munich and the betrayal of Spain. Hitler-Fascism grew stronger. How the international situation developed after Munich (September 1938) is brilliantly set forth in the extracts from Stalin's speech before the 18th Congress of the C. P. S. U. (B.) (March 1939) which follows the Comintern documents. Stalin points out here how the bloc of the three aggressor nations viz., Hitlerite Germany, Fascist Italy and Militarist-Fascist Japan came to be formed. He showed how the so-called policy of non-intervention followed by the other imperialist powers, notably Britain, was leading not directly to a war against the Soviet Union, as the authors of that policy were planning, but rather to an imperialist war. Stalin emphasises that the Second Imperialist War was already a fact. Stalin here clearly hinted that Hitlerite Germany, being afraid of the might of the U.S.S.R., was unwilling to attack the U.S.S.R. as desired by the reactionaries in Britain and predicted the fiasco which later befell them.

Dimitrov's article (November 1939) which follows, takes up the theoretical clarification of the period which opened after the outbreak of war between Britain and Germany, and of the circumstances which led up to it. This is followed by two articles by Comrade P. C. Joshi, the leader of the Communist Party of India. The first of these articles deals with how the imperialist war turned into people's war on the 22nd of June, while the second deals with the significance of the new revolutionary period of the people's war. The book closes with an article which appeared in the *Communist International* on May Day 1942 and with an extract from Stalin's speech, November 7, 1942. All these articles show very clearly how the successive transformation in the world situation necessitated the transition from the policy of the Peace Front to that of opposing the imperialist war and finally to the policy of rallying the people for winning the war of liberation.

Such are briefly the documents collected together in this volume. They need to be studied together by everyone who wants to understand the present period of the people's war and the tasks which it imposes upon every patriot. They have not gone musty with time. On the other hand, they have gained in value. What Stalin said in 1934 and what the Communist International said in 1935 reads now like a prophetic pre-vision, a warning and a lead. It will impress him with

the continuity of the Communist policy. The thoughtful reader will find that it is not the Communist Party which has made the alleged "somersaults." The most surprising somersaults were made by the tricky history of a world imperialism in crisis. The world Communist Party and its leaders foresaw these twists and turns. They put forward practical policies to steer humanity clear of rocks and whirlwinds into the haven of peace, freedom and progress. But the test of a policy is not merely that it is correct but its effective carrying out by patriots and the people. We hope this book will help Communists and patriots in equipping themselves for more effectively discharging the tasks in the present critical period.

*Bombay,
24th November, 1942.*

G. ADHIKARI.

STALIN

FASCISM AND THE DRIVE TOWARDS NEW IMPERIALIST WAR

*[From Stalin's Report at the 17th Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B)
26th January, 1934.]*

A RESULT of the protracted economic crisis has been the hitherto unprecedented tension in the political situation in capitalist countries, both within these countries and in their mutual relations.

The intensified struggle for foreign markets, the disappearance of the last vestiges of free trade, prohibitive tariffs, trade war, currency war, dumping, and many other analogous measures which demonstrate extreme *Nationalism* in economic policy have made the relations among the various countries extremely strained, have prepared the ground for military conflicts, and have put on the order of the day war as a means for a new redivision of the world and of spheres of influence in favour of the stronger states.

Japan's war against China, the occupation of Manchuria, Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations, and her advance in North China have made the situation still more tense. The intensified struggle for the Pacific and the growth of naval armaments in Japan, the United States, Great Britain and France are results of this increased tension.

Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations and the spectre of revenge have further added to the tension and have given a fresh impetus to the growth of armaments in Europe.

It is not surprising that bourgeois pacifism is now dragging out a miserable existence, and that idle talk of disarmament is giving way to "business-like" talk about armament and re-armament.

Again, as in 1914, the parties of bellicose imperialism, the parties of war and revenge are coming into the foreground.

Quite clearly things are heading for a new war.

The internal situation of the capitalist countries, in view of the operation of these same factors, is becoming even more tense. Four years of industrial crisis have exhausted the

working class and reduced it to despair. Four years of agricultural crisis have utterly ruined the poorer strata of the peasantry, not only in the principal capitalist countries, but also—and particularly—in the dependent and colonial countries. It is a fact that, notwithstanding all attempts to manipulate statistics in order to show a drop in unemployment, the number of unemployed, according to the official figures of bourgeois institutions, reaches 3,000,000 in Great Britain, 5,000,000 in Germany and 10,000,000 in the United States not to mention the other European countries. Add to this the more than ten million part-time workers ; add the millions of ruined peasants—and you will get an approximate picture of the poverty and despair of the labouring masses. The masses of the people have not yet reached the stage when they are ready to storm capitalism ; but the idea of storming it is maturing in the minds of the masses—of that there can hardly be any doubt. This is eloquently testified to by such facts as, say, the Spanish revolution which overthrew the fascist regime, and the expansion of the Soviet districts in China, which the united counter-revolution of the Chinese and foreign bourgeoisie is unable to stop.

This, indeed, explains why the ruling classes in the capitalist countries are so zealously destroying or nullifying the last vestiges of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy which might be used by the working class in its struggle against the oppressors ; why they are driving the Communist Parties underground and resorting to open terrorist methods to maintain their dictatorship.

Chauvinism and preparation for war as the main elements of foreign policy ; repression of the working class and terrorism in the sphere of home policy as a necessary means for strengthening the rear with a view to future wars—that is what is now particularly engaging the minds of contemporary imperialist politicians.

It is not surprising that fascism has now become the most fashionable commodity among bellicose bourgeois politicians. I am referring not only to fascism in general, but, primarily, to fascism of the German type, which is wrongly called National-Socialism—wrongly because the most searching examination will fail to reveal even an atom of Socialism in it.

In this connection the victory of fascism in Germany must be regarded not only as a symptom of the weakness of the working class and as a result of the betrayals of the working

class by the Social-Democratic Party, which paved the way for fascism; it must also be regarded as a symptom of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, of the fact that the bourgeoisie is already unable to rule by the old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois-democracy, and, as a consequence, is compelled in its home policy to resort to terroristic methods of rule—as a symptom of the fact that it is no longer able to find a way out of the present situation on the basis of a peaceful foreign policy, and that, as a consequence, it is compelled to resort to a policy of war.

That is the situation.

As you see, things are heading towards a new imperialist war as a way out of the present situation.

Of course, there are no grounds for assuming that a war can provide a real way out. On the contrary, it will confuse the situation still more. More than that, it is sure to unleash revolution and jeopardize the very existence of capitalism in a number of countries, as was the case in the course of the first imperialist war. And if, notwithstanding the experience of the first imperialist war, the bourgeois politicians clutch at war as a drowning man clutches at a straw, that shows that they have gotten into a hopeless mess, have reached an impasse, and are ready to rush headlong over the precipice.

It will not be amiss, therefore, briefly to examine the plans for the organisation of war which are now being hatched in the circles of bourgeois politicians.

Some think that war should be organised against some one of the Great Powers. They think of inflicting a crushing defeat upon that Power and of improving their own affairs at its expense. Let us assume that they organise such a war. What may be the upshot? As is well known, during the first imperialist war it was also intended to destroy one of the Great Powers, viz., Germany, and to profit at her expense. And what was the upshot of this? They did not destroy Germany; but they sowed such a hatred for the victor in Germany, and created such a soil for revenge, that they have not been able to clear up the revolting mess they made even to this day, and will not, perhaps, be able to do so for quite some time. But they did get the smash up of capitalism in Russia, the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia, and, of course, the Soviet Union. What guarantee is there that the second imperialist war will produce "better" results

for them than the first? Would it not be more correct to assume that the opposite will be the case?

Others think that war should be organised against a country that is weak in the military sense, but represents an extensive market, for example, against China, which, it transpires, cannot even be described as a state in the strict sense of the word, but is merely "unorganised territory" which needs to be seized by strong states. They evidently want to divide her up completely and improve their affairs at her expense. Let us assume that they organise such a war. What may be the upshot? It is well known that at the beginning of the nineteenth century Italy and Germany were regarded in the same light as China today, i.e., they were considered "unorganised territories" and not states, and they were subjugated. But what was the upshot of this? As is well known, the upshot was wars for independence waged by Germany and Italy, and the amalgamation of these countries into independent states. The upshot was increased hatred for the oppressors in the hearts of the peoples of these countries, the results of which have not been removed to this day and will not, perhaps, be removed for quite some time. The question arises: What guarantee is there that the same thing will not result from an imperialist war against China?

Still others think that war should be organised by a "superior race," say, the German "race," against an "inferior race," primarily against the Slavs; that only such a war can provide a way out of the situation, for it is the mission of the "superior race" to fructify the "inferior race" and rule over it. Let us assume that this queer theory, which is as far removed from science as the sky from earth, let us assume that this queer theory is put into practice. What may be the upshot? It is well known that ancient Rome looked upon the ancestors of the present-day Germans and French in the same way as the representatives of the "superior race" now look upon the Slavonic tribes. It is well known that ancient Rome treated them as an "inferior race," as "barbarians," destined to live in eternal subordination to the "superior race," to "great Rome," and, between ourselves be it said, ancient Rome had some grounds for this, which cannot be said of the representatives of "superior race" of today. (*Loud applause.*) But what was the upshot of this? The upshot was that the non-Romans, i.e., all the "barbarians," united against the common enemy, hurled themselves against Rome,

and bore her down with a crash. The question arises: What guarantee is there that the claims of the representatives of the "superior race" of today will not lead to the same deplorable results? What guarantee is there that the fascist literary politicians in Berlin will be more fortunate than the old and experienced conquerors in Rome? Would it not be more correct to assume that the opposite will be the case?

Still others, again, think that war should be organised against the U.S.S.R. Their plan is to defeat the U.S.S.R., divide its territory, and profit at its expense. It would be a mistake to believe that it is only certain military circles in Japan who think in this way. We know that similar plans are being hatched in the leading political circles of certain states in Europe. Let us assume that these gentlemen pass from words to deeds. What may be the upshot? There can hardly be any doubt that such a war would be the most dangerous war for the bourgeoisie. It would be the most dangerous war, not only because the peoples of the U.S.S.R. would fight to the very death to preserve the gains of the revolution; it would be the most dangerous war for the bourgeoisie for the added reason that it would be waged not only at the fronts, but also behind the enemy's lines. The bourgeoisie needs have no doubt that the numerous friends of the working class of the U.S.S.R. in Europe and in Asia will do their best to strike a blow in the rear at their oppressors who start a criminal war against the fatherland of the working class of all countries. And let not Messieurs the bourgeoisie blame us if some of the governments so near and dear to them, which today rule happily "by the grace of god," are missing on the morrow after the outbreak of such a war. (*Thunderous applause.*) One such war against the U.S.S.R. has been waged already, if you remember, fifteen years ago. As is well known, the universally esteemed Churchill clothed this war in a poetic formula—"the march of fourteen states." You remember, of course, that this war rallied the working people of our country into one united camp of heroic warriors, who stalwartly defended their workers' and peasants' homeland against the foreign foe. You know how it ended. It ended in the ejection of the invaders from our country and the establishment of revolutionary Councils of Action in Europe. It can hardly be doubted that a second war against the U.S.S.R. will lead to the complete defeat of the aggressors, to revolution in a number of countries in Europe and in Asia, and to the destruction of

the bourgeois-landlord governments in those countries.

Such are the war plans of the perplexed bourgeois politicians.

As you see, they are not distinguished either for their brilliance or for their valour. (*Applause.*)

But while the bourgeoisie chooses the path of war, the working class in the capitalist countries, brought to despair by four years of crisis and unemployment, is taking the path of revolution. This means that a revolutionary crisis is maturing and will continue to mature. And the more the bourgeoisie becomes entangled in its war combinations, the more frequently it resorts to terroristic methods in its fight against the working class and the labouring peasantry, the more rapidly will the revolutionary crisis develop.

Some comrades think that, once there is a revolutionary crisis, the bourgeoisie must be in a hopeless position; that its end is therefore predetermined; that the victory of the revolution is thus assured, and that all they have to do is to wait for the fall of the bourgeoisie and to draw up victorious resolutions. This is a profound mistake. The victory of the revolution never comes by itself. It must be prepared for and won. And only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare for and win victory. Moments occur when the situation is revolutionary, when the rule of the bourgeoisie is shaken to its very foundations, and yet the victory of the revolution does not come, because there is no revolutionary party of the proletariat sufficiently strong and influential to lead the masses and to take power. It would be unwise to believe that such "cases" cannot occur.

It will not be amiss in this connection to recall Lenin's prophetic words on revolutionary crises, uttered at the Second Congress of the Communist International:

"We have now come to the question of the revolutionary crisis as the basis of our revolutionary action. And here we must first of all note two widespread errors. On the one hand, the bourgeois economists represent this crisis simply as 'unrest,' as the English so elegantly express it. On the other hand, revolutionaries sometimes try to prove that the crisis is absolutely hopeless. That is a mistake. There is no such thing as an absolutely hopeless situation. The bourgeoisie is behaving like an arrant brigand who has lost his head; it commits blunder after blunder, thus making the situation more acute and hastening its own doom. All this is true. But it cannot be 'proved' that there is absolutely no chance of its gulling

some minority of the exploited with some concessions or other, or of suppressing some movement or uprising of some section or another of the oppressed and exploited. To try to 'prove' beforehand that a situation is 'absolutely' hopeless would be sheer pedantry, or juggling with concepts and catchwords. In this and similar questions the only real 'proof' is practice. The bourgeois system all over the world is experiencing a most profound revolutionary crisis. And the revolutionary parties must now 'prove' by their practical actions that they are intelligent and organised enough, are in contact enough with the exploited masses, are determined and skilful enough to utilise this crisis for a successful and victorious revolution." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 102.) •

DIMITROV

FASCISM AND THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

(Report delivered at the Seventh Congress of the Communist
International on August 2, 1935.)

1. FASCISM AND THE WORKING-CLASS

COMRADES, as early as its Sixth Congress, the Communist International warned the world proletariat that a new fascist offensive was impending, and called for a struggle against it. The Congress pointed out that "in a more or less developed form, fascist tendencies and the germs of a fascist movement are to be found almost everywhere."

With the outbreak of the present most profound economic crisis, the sharp accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism and the revolutionization of the toiling masses, fascism has embarked upon a wide offensive. The ruling bourgeoisie is more and more seeking salvation in fascism, with the object of instituting exceptional predatory measures against the toilers, preparing for an imperialist war of plunder, attacking the Soviet Union, enslaving and partitioning China, and by all these means preventing revolution.

Imperialist circles are endeavouring to place the *whole* burden of the crisis on the backs of the toilers. *That is why they need fascism.*

They are trying to solve the problem of markets by enslaving the weak nations, by intensifying colonial oppression and repartitioning the world anew by means of war. *That is why they need fascism.*

They are striving to *forestall* the growth of the forces of revolution by smashing the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants and by undertaking a military attack against the Soviet Union—the bulwark of the world proletariat. *That is why they need fascism.*

In a number of countries, Germany in particular, these imperialist circles have succeeded, *before* the masses have decisively turned towards revolution, in inflicting defeat on

the proletariat and establishing a fascist dictatorship.

• But what is characteristic of the victory of fascism is the fact that this victory, on the one hand, bears witness to the weakness of the proletariat, disorganized and paralyzed by the disruptive Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and, on the other, expresses the weakness of the bourgeoisie itself, afraid of the realization of a united struggle of the working class, afraid of revolution, and no longer in a position to maintain its dictatorship over the masses by the old methods of bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism.

The victory of fascism in Germany, Comrade Stalin said at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union :

"....must be regarded not only as a symptom of the weakness of the working class and as a result of the betrayal of the working class of Social-Democracy, which paved the way for fascism ; it must also be regarded as a symptom of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, as a symptom of the fact that the bourgeoisie is already unable to rule by the old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, and, as a consequence, is compelled in its home policy to resort to terroristic methods of administration—it must be taken as a symptom of the fact that it is no longer able to find a way out of the present situation on the basis of a peaceful foreign policy, as a consequence of which it is compelled to resort to a policy of war."*

THE CLASS CHARACTER OF FASCISM

Comrades, as was correctly described by the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, fascism in power is *the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital.*

The most reactionary variety of fascism is the *German type* of fascism. It has the effrontery to call itself National-Socialism, though having nothing in common with Socialism. Hitler fascism is not only bourgeois nationalism, it is bestial chauvinism. It is a government system of political banditry, a system of provocation and torture practised upon the working class and the revolutionary elements of the peasantry, the

**Socialism Victorious*, pp. 11-12.

petty bourgeoisie" and the intelligentsia. It is medieval barbarity and bestiality, it is unbridled aggression in relation to other nations and countries.

German fascism is acting as the *spearhead of international counter-revolution*, as the *chief incendiary of imperialist war*, as the *initiator of a crusade against the Soviet Union*, the *great fatherland of the toilers of the whole world*.

Fascism is not a form of state power "standing above both classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie," as Otto Bauer, for instance has asserted. It is not "the revolt of the petty bourgeoisie which has captured the machinery of the State," as the British Socialist Brailsford declares. No, fascism is not superclass government, nor government of the petty bourgeoisie or the lumpenproletariat over finance capital. Fascism is the power of finance capital itself. It is the organization of terrorist vengeance against the working class and the revolutionary section of the peasantry and intelligentsia. In foreign policy, fascism is chauvinism in its crudest form, fomenting the bestial hatred of other nations.

This, the true character of fascism, must be particularly stressed; because in a number of countries fascism, under cover of social demagogy, has managed to gain the following of the petty-bourgeois masses who have been driven out of their course by the crisis, and even of certain sections of the most backward strata of the proletariat. These would never have supported fascism if they had understood its class character and its true nature.

The development of fascism, and the fascist dictatorship itself, assume *different forms* in different countries, according to historical, social and economic conditions and to the national peculiarities and the international position of the given country. In certain countries, principally those in which fascism does not enjoy a broad mass basis and in which the struggle of the various groups within the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie itself is fairly acute, fascism does not immediately venture to abolish parliament, but allows the other bourgeois parties, as well as the Social-Democratic parties, to retain a certain degree of legality. In other countries, where the ruling bourgeoisie fears an *early* outbreak of revolution, fascism establishes its unrestricted political monopoly, either immediately or by intensifying its reign of terror against and persecution of all competing parties and groups. This does not prevent fascism, when its position becomes *particularly* acute, from endeavouring to

extend its basis and without altering its class nature, combining open terrorist dictatorship with a crude sham of parliamentarism.

The accession to power of fascism is not an *ordinary succession* of one bourgeois government by another, but a *substitution* for one state form of class domination of the bourgeoisie—bourgeois democracy—of another form—open terrorist dictatorship. It would be a serious mistake to ignore this distinction, a mistake which would prevent the revolutionary proletariat from mobilizing the broadest strata of the toilers of town and country for the struggle against the menace of the seizure of power by the fascists, and from taking advantage of the contradictions which exist in the camp of the bourgeoisie itself. But it is a mistake no less serious and dangerous to *underrate* the importance, in establishing the fascist dictatorship, of the *reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie which are at present being increasingly initiated in bourgeois-democratic countries*—measures which destroy the democratic liberties of the toilers, falsify and curtail the rights of parliament and intensify the repression of the revolutionary movement.

Comrades, the accession to power of fascism must not be conceived of in so simplified and smooth a form, as though some committee or other of finance capital decided on a certain date to set up a fascist dictatorship. In reality, fascism usually comes to power in the course of a mutual, and at times severe, struggle against the old bourgeois parties, or a definite section of these parties, in the course of a struggle even within the fascist camp itself—a struggle which at times leads to armed clashes, as we have witnessed in the case of Germany, Austria and other countries. All this, however, does not detract from the fact that before the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, bourgeois governments usually pass through a number of preliminary stages and institute a number of reactionary measures which directly facilitate the accession to power of fascism. Whoever *does not* fight the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie and the growth of fascism at these preparatory stages is *not in a position to prevent the victory of fascism, but, on the contrary, facilitates that victory.*

The Social-Democratic leaders glossed over and concealed from the masses the true class nature of fascism, and did not call them to the struggle against the increasingly reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie. They bear great *historical responsibility* for the fact that, at the decisive moment of the fascist

offensive, a large section of the toiling masses of Germany and a number of other fascist countries failed to recognize in fascism the most bloodthirsty monster of finance, their most vicious enemy, and that these masses were not prepared to resist it.

What is the source of the influence enjoyed by fascism over the masses? Fascism is able to attract the masses because it demagogically appeals to their *most urgent needs and demands*. Fascism not only inflames prejudices that are deeply ingrained in the masses, but also plays on the better sentiments of the masses, on their sense of justice, and sometimes even on their revolutionary traditions. Why do the German fascists, those lackeys of the big bourgeoisie and mortal enemies of socialism, represent themselves to the masses as "socialists," and depict their accession to power as a "revolution"? Because they try to exploit the faith in revolution, the urge towards socialism, which live in the hearts of the broad masses of the toilers of Germany.

Fascism acts in the interests of the extreme imperialists, but it presents itself to the masses in the guise of champion of an ill-treated nation, and appeals to outraged national sentiments, as German fascism did, for instance, when it won the support of the masses by the slogan "Against the Versailles Treaty!"

Fascism aims at the most unbridled exploitation of the masses, but it appeals to them with the most artful anti-capitalist demagogy, taking advantage of the profound hatred entertained by the toilers for the piratical bourgeoisie, the banks, trusts and the financial magnates, and advancing slogans which at the given moment are most alluring to the politically immature masses. In Germany—"The general welfare is higher than the welfare of the individual"; in Italy—"Our state is not a capitalist, but a corporate state"; in Japan—"For Japan, without exploitation"; in the United States—"Share the Wealth," and so forth.

Fascism delivers up the people to be devoured by the most corrupt, most venal elements, but comes before them with the demand for "an honest and incorruptible government." Speculating on the profound disillusionment of the masses in bourgeois-democratic governments, fascism hypocritically denounces corruption (for instance, the Barmat and Sklarek affairs in Germany, the Stavisky affairs in France, and numerous others).

It is in the interests of the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie that fascism intercepts the disappointed masses as

- they leave the old bourgeois parties. But it impresses these masses by the *severity of its attacks* on bourgeois governments and its irreconcilable attitude toward the old bourgeois parties.

Surpassing in its cynicism and hypocrisy all other varieties of bourgeois reaction, *fascism adapts* its demagogy to the national *peculiarities* of each country, and even to the peculiarities of the various social strata in one and the same country. And the petty-bourgeois masses, even a section of the workers, reduced to despair by want, unemployment and the insecurity of their existence, fall victim to the social and chauvinist demagogy of fascism..

Fascism comes to power as a *party of attack* on the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, on the masses of the people who are in a state of unrest; yet it stages its accession to power as a "revolutionary" movement against the bourgeoisie on behalf of "the whole nation" and for "the salvation" of the nation. (Let us recall Mussolini's "march" on Rome, Pilsudski's "march" on Warsaw, Hitler's National-Socialist "revolution" in Germany, and so forth.)

But whatever the masks which fascism adopts, whatever the forms in which it presents itself, whatever the ways by which it comes to power—

Fascism is a most ferocious attack by capital on the toiling masses;

Fascism is unbridled chauvinism and annexationist war;

Fascism is rabid reaction and counter-revolution;

Fascism is the most vicious enemy of the working class and of all the toilers!

WHAT DOES VICTORIOUS FASCISM BRING FOR THE MASSES?

Fascism promised the workers "a fair wage," but actually it has brought them an even lower, a pauper standard of living. It promised work for the unemployed, but actually has brought them even more painful torments of starvation, and compulsory, servile labor. It actually converts the workers and unemployed into pariahs of capitalist society stripped of rights, destroys their trade unions; deprives them of the right to strike and to have their working class press, forces them into fascist organizations, plunders their social insurance funds and transforms the mills and factories into barracks where the unbridled arbitrary rule of the capitalists prevails.

Fascism promised the toiling *youth* a broad highway to a brilliant future. But actually it has brought with it wholesale dismissals of young workers, labor camps and continuous military drilling for a war of conquest.

Fascism promised the *office workers*, the *petty officials* and the *intellectual* to ensure them security of existence, to destroy the omnipotence of the trusts and wipe out profiteering by bank capital. But actually it has brought them an even greater degree of hopelessness and uncertainty as to the morrow; it is subjecting them to a new bureaucracy made up of the most compliant of its followers, it is setting up an intolerable dictatorship of the trust, and fosters corruption and degeneration to an unprecedented extent.

Fascism promised the ruined and impoverished *peasants* to put an end to debt bondage, to abolish rent and even to alienate the landed estates without compensation, in the interests of the landless and ruined peasants. But actually it is placing the toiling peasants in a state of unprecedented servitude to the trusts and the fascist state apparatus, and promotes the exploitation of the great mass of the peasantry by the big agrarians, the banks and the usurers to the very utmost limit.

"Germany will be a peasant country, or will not be at all," Hitler solemnly declared. And what did the peasants of Germany get under Hitler? A moratorium, which has already been cancelled? Or a law on the inheritance of peasant property, which is resulting in millions of sons and daughters of peasants being squeezed out of the villages and reduced to paupers? Farm labourers have been transformed into semi-serfs, deprived even of the elementary right of free movement. Toiling peasants have been deprived of the opportunity of selling the produce of their farms in the market.

And in Poland?

"The Polish peasant," says the Polish newspaper, *Czas*, "employs methods and means which were used perhaps only in the Middle Ages; he nurses the fire in his stove and lends it to his neighbour; he splits matches into several parts; he lends dirty soap-water to others; he boils herring barrels in order to obtain salt water. This is not a fable, but the actual state of affairs in the countryside, of the truth of which anybody may convince himself."

And it is not Communists who write this, comrades, but a Polish reactionary newspaper!

But this is by no means all.

Every day, in the concentration camps of fascist Germany, in the cellars of the Gestapo (German secret police), in the torture chambers of Poland, in the cells of the Bulgarian and Finnish secret police, in the "Glavnyacha" in Belgrade, in the Rumanian "Siguranza" and on the Italian islands, some of the best sons of the working class, revolutionary peasants, fighters for the splendid future of mankind, are being subjected to revolting tortures and indignities, before which pale the most abominable acts of the tsarist secret police. The villainous German fascists beat husbands to a bloody pulp in the presence of their wives, and send the ashes of murdered sons by parcel post to their mothers. Sterilization has been made a method of political warfare. In the torture chambers, captured anti-fascists are given injections of poison, their arms are broken, their eyes gouged out; they are strung up and have water pumped into them; the fascist swastika is carved in their living flesh.

I have before me a statistical summary drawn up by the International Red Aid—the international organization for aid to revolutionary fighters—regarding the number of killed, wounded, arrested, maimed and tortured to death in Germany, Poland, Italy, Austria, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia. In Germany alone, since the National-Socialists came to power, over 4,200 anti-fascist workers, peasants, employees, intellectuals—Communists, Social-Democrats and members of opposition Christian organizations—have been murdered, 317,800 arrested, 218,600 wounded and subjected to excruciating tortures. In Austria, since the battles of February last year, the "Christian" fascist government has murdered 1,900 revolutionary workers, maimed and wounded 10,000 and arrested 40,000. And this summary, comrades, is far from complete.

Words fail me in describing the indignation which seizes us at the thought of the torments which the toilers are now suffering in a number of fascist countries. The facts and figures we quote *do not reflect one-hundredth part of the true picture* of the exploitation and the tortures inflicted by the White Terror which make up the daily life of the working class in many capitalist countries. Volumes cannot give a just picture of the countless brutalities inflicted by fascism on the toilers.

With feelings of profound emotion and hatred for the fascist butchers, we lower the banners of the Communist Inter-

national before the unforgettable memory of John Scheer, Fiete Schulz and Luttgens in Germany, Koloman Wallisch and Munichreiter in Austria, Sallai and Furst in Hungary, Kofardzhiev, Lutibrosky and Voikov in Bulgaria—before the memory of thousands and thousands of Communists, Social-Democrats and non-partisan workers, peasants and representatives of the progressive intelligentsia who have laid down their lives in the struggle against fascism.

From this platform we greet the leader of the German proletariat and the honorary chairman of our Congress—Comrade Thaelmann. (*Loud applause, all rise.*) We greet Comrades Rakosi, Gramsci (*loud applause, all rise*), Antikainen and Yonko Panov. We greet the leader of the Spanish Socialists, Caballero, imprisoned by the counter-revolutionaries, Tom Mooney, who has been languishing in prison for eighteen years, and the thousands of other prisoners of capitalism and fascism (*loud applause*), and we say to them: "Brothers in the fight, brothers in arms, you are not forgotten. We are with you. We shall give every hour of our lives, every drop of our blood, for your liberation, and for the liberation of all toilers, from the shameful regime of fascism." (*Loud applause, all rise.*)

Comrades, it was Lenin who warned us that the bourgeoisie may succeed in overwhelming the toilers by savage terror, in checking the growing forces of revolution for brief periods of time, but that, nevertheless, this would not save it from its doom.

"Life," Lenin wrote, "will assert itself. Let the bourgeoisie rave, work itself into a frenzy, overdo things, commit stupidities, take vengeance on the Bolsheviks in advance and endeavor to kill off (in India, Hungary, Germany, etc.), hundreds, thousands, and hundreds of thousands more of yesterday's and tomorrow's Bolsheviks. Acting thus, the bourgeoisie acts as all classes doomed by history have acted. Communists should know that the future, at any rate, belong to them; therefore, we can, and must, combine the most intense passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the coolest and most sober of the mad-ravings of the bourgeoisie."*

Aye, if we and the proletariat of the whole world firmly follow the path indicated by Lenin and Stalin, the bourgeoisie will perish in spite of everything. (*Applause.*)

*Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder
Little Lenin Library, p. 80.

IS THE VICTORY OF FASCISM INEVITABLE?

Why was it that fascism could triumph, and how?

Fascism is the most vicious enemy of the working class and the toilers. Fascism is the enemy of nine-tenths of the German people, nine-tenths of the Austrian people, nine-tenths of the other people in fascist countries. How, in what way, could this vicious enemy triumph?

Fascism was able to come to power *primarily* because the working class, owing to the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the Social-Democratic leaders, *proved to be split, politically and organizationally disarmed*, in face of the onslaught of the bourgeoisie. And the Communist Parties, on the other hand, were *not strong enough* to be able, apart from and in the teeth of the Social-Democrats, to rouse the masses and to lead them in a decisive struggle against fascism.

And, indeed, let the millions of Social-Democratic workers, who together with their Communist brothers are now experiencing the horrors of fascist barbarism, seriously reflect on this. If, in 1918, when revolution broke out in Germany and Austria, the Austrian and German proletariat had not followed the Social-Democratic leadership of Otto Bauer, Friedrich Adler and Karl Renner in Austria and Ebert and Scheidemann in Germany, but had followed the road of the Russian Bolsheviks, the road of Lenin and Stalin, there would now be no fascism in Austria or Germany, in Italy or Hungary, in Poland or in the Balkans. Not the bourgeoisie, but the working class would long ago have been the master of the situation in Europe. (Applause.)

Take, for example, the *Austrian* Social-Democratic Party. The revolution of 1918 raised it to a tremendous height. It held the power in its hands, it held strong positions in the army and in the state apparatus. Relying on these positions, it could have nipped fascism in the bud. But it surrendered one position of the working class after another without resistance. It permitted the bourgeoisie to strengthen its power, annul the constitution, purge the state apparatus, army and police force of Social-Democratic functionaries and take the arsenals away from the workers. It allowed the fascist bandits to murder Social-Democratic workers with impunity and accepted the terms of the Huetttenberg pact, which gave the fascist elements entry to the factories. At the same time the Social-

Democratic leaders fooled the workers with the Linz program, in which the alternative was provided for the possibility of using armed force against the bourgeoisie and for the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship, assuring them that in the event of the ruling class using force against the working class, the party would reply by a call for a general strike and for armed struggle. As though the whole policy of preparation for a fascist attack on the working class were not one chain of acts of violence against the working class masked by constitutional forms. Even on the eve and in the course of the February battles the Austrian Social-Democratic leaders left the heroically fighting Schutzbund isolated from the broad masses and doomed the Austrian proletariat to defeat.

Was the victory of fascism inevitable in Germany? No, the German working class could have prevented it.

But in order to do so, it should have compelled the establishment of a united anti-fascist proletarian front, forced the Social-Democratic leaders to put a stop to their campaign against the Communists and to accept the repeated proposals of the Communist Party for united action against fascism.

When fascism was on the offensive and the bourgeois-democratic liberties were being progressively abolished by the bourgeoisie, it should not have contented itself with the verbal resolutions of the Social-Democrats, but should have replied by a genuine mass struggle, which would have made the fulfilment of the fascist plans of the German bourgeoisie more difficult.

It should not have allowed the prohibition of the League of Red Front Fighters by the government of Braun and Severing, and should have established fighting contact between the League and the Reichsbanner,* with its nearly one million members, and have compelled Braun and Severing to arm both these organizations in order to resist and smash the fascist bands.

It should have compelled the Social-Democratic leaders who headed the Prussian government to adopt measures of defense against fascism, arrest the fascist leaders, close down their press, confiscate their material resources and the resources of the capitalists who were financing the fascist movement,

*Reichsbanner—"The Flag of the Realm," a Social-Democratic semi-military mass organization.

dissolve the fascist organizations, deprive them of the weapons, and so forth.

Furthermore, it should have secured the re-establishment and extension of all forms of social assistance and the introduction of a moratorium and crisis benefits for the peasants—who were being—ruined under the influence of crises—by taxing the banks and the trusts, in this way securing for itself the support of the toiling peasantry. It was the fault of the Social-Democrats of Germany that this was not done, and that is why fascism *was able* to triumph.

Was it inevitable that the bourgeoisie and the nobility should have triumphed in *Spain*, a country where the forces of proletarian revolt are so advantageously combined with a peasant war?

The Spanish Socialists were in the government from the first days of the revolution. Did they establish fighting contact between the working class organizations of every political opinion, including the Communists and the Anarchists, and did they weld the working class into a united trade union organization? Did they demand the confiscation of all the lands of the landlords, the church and the monasteries in favour of the peasants in order to win over the latter to the side of the revolution? Did they attempt to fight for national self-determination for the Catalonians and the Basques, and for the liberation of Morocco? Did they purge the army of monarchist and fascist elements and prepare it for passing over to the side of the workers, and peasants? Did they dissolve the Civil Guard, so detested by the people, the executioner of every movement of the people? Did they strike at the fascist party of Gil Robles and at the might of the Catholic church? No, they did none of these things. They rejected the frequent proposals of the Communists for united action against the offensive of the bourgeois-landlord reaction and fascism; they passed election laws which enabled the reactionaries to gain a majority in the Cortes (parliament), laws which penalized popular movements, laws under which the heroic miners of Asturias are now being tried. They had peasants who were fighting for land shot by the Civil Guard, and so on. *

This is the way in which the Social-Democrats, by disorganizing and splitting the ranks of the working class, cleared the path to power for fascism in Germany, in Austria, in Spain.

Comrades, fascism also triumphed for the reason that the proletariat found itself isolated from its natural allies. Fascism

triumphed because it was able to win over *large masses of the peasantry*, owing to the fact that the Social-Democrats, in the name of the working class, pursued what was in fact an anti-peasant policy. The peasant saw in power a number of Social-Democratic governments, which in his eyes were an embodiment of the power of the working class, but not one of them put an end to peasant want, none of them gave land to the peasantry. In Germany, the Social-Democrats did not touch the landlords; they combatted the strikes of the agricultural workers, with the result that long before Hitler came to power the agricultural workers of Germany were abandoning the reformist trade unions and in the majority of cases were going over to the Stahlhelm and to the National-Socialists.

Fascism also triumphed for the reason that it was able to penetrate the ranks of the *youth*, whereas the Social-Democrats diverted the working class youth from the class struggle, while the revolutionary proletariat did not develop the necessary educational work among the youth and did not devote sufficient attention to the struggle for its specific interests and demands. Fascism grasped the very acute need of the youth for militant activity, and enticed a considerable section of the youth into its fighting detachments. The new generation of young men and women have not experienced the horrors of war. They have felt the full weight of the economic crisis, unemployment, and the disintegration of bourgeois democracy. But, seeing no prospects for the future, large numbers of young people have proved to be particularly receptive to fascist demagogy, which depicted for them an alluring future should fascism succeed.

In this connection, we cannot avoid referring also to a number of *mistakes committed by the Communist Parties*, mistakes that hampered our struggle against fascism.

In our ranks there were people who intolerably underrated the fascist danger, a tendency which has not everywhere been overcome to this day. Of this nature was the opinion formerly to be met with in our Parties to the effect that "Germany is not Italy," meaning that fascism may have succeeded in Italy; but that its success in Germany was out of the question, because the latter was an industrially and culturally highly developed country, with forty years of traditions of the working class movement, in which fascism was impossible. Or the kind of opinion which is to be met with nowadays, to the effect that in countries of "classical" bourgeois democracy the

soil for fascism does not exist. Such opinions may serve and have served to weaken vigilance with regard to the fascist danger, and to render the mobilization of the proletariat in the struggle against fascism more difficult.

One might also cite a number of instances in which Communists were caught unawares by the fascist coup. Remember Bulgaria, where the leadership of our Party took up a "neutral," but in fact opportunist, position with regard to the *coup d'etat* of June 9, 1923; Poland, where, in May, 1926, the leadership of the Communist Party, making a wrong estimate of the motive forces of the Polish revolution, did not realize the fascist nature of Pilsudski's *coup*, and trailed in the rear of events; Finland, where our Party based itself on a false conception of slow and gradual fascization and overlooked the fascist *coup* which was being prepared by the leading group of the bourgeoisie and which caught the Party and the working class unawares.

When National-Socialism had already become a menacing mass movement in Germany, certain comrades, like Heinz Neumann, who regarded the Bruening government as already a government of fascist dictatorship, boastfully declared: "If Hitler's 'Third Empire' ever comes about, it will only be six feet underground, and above it will be the victorious power of the workers."

Our comrades in Germany for a long time failed to reckon with the wounded national sentiments and indignation of the masses at the Versailles Treaty; they treated as of little account the vacillations of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie; they were late in drawing up their program of social and national emancipation, and when they did put it forward they were unable to adapt it to the concrete demands and the level of the masses. They were even unable to popularize it widely among the masses.

In a number of countries the necessary development of a mass fight against fascism was replaced by sterile hair splitting as to the nature of fascism "in general" and by a *narrow sectarian attitude* in presenting and solving the actual political problems of the Party.

Comrades, it is not simply because we want to dig up the past that we speak of the causes of the victory of fascism, that we point to the historical responsibility of the Social-Democrats for the defeat of the working class, and that we also point out our own mistakes in the fight against fascism.

We are not historians divorced from living reality ; we, active fighters of the working class, are obliged to answer the question that is tormenting millions of workers : *Can the victory of fascism be prevented, and how ?* And we reply to these millions of workers : Yes, comrades, the road in the way of fascism can be blocked. It is quite possible. It depends on ourselves—on the workers, the peasants and all the toilers !

Whether the victory of fascism can be prevented depends *in the first place* on the militant activity displayed by the working class itself, on whether its forces are welded into a single militant army combating the offensive of capitalism and fascism. Having established its fighting unity, the proletariat would paralyze the influence of fascism over the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, the youth and the intelligentsia, and would be able to neutralize one section and win over another section.

Second, it depends on the existence of a strong revolutionary party, correctly leading the struggle of the toilers against fascism. A party which systematically calls on the workers to retreat in the face of fascism and permits the fascist bourgeoisie to strengthen its positions will inevitably lead the workers to defeat.

Third, it depends on whether a correct policy is pursued by the working class towards the peasantry and the petty-bourgeois masses of the towns. These masses must be taken as they are, and not as we should like to have them. It is only in the process of the struggle that they will overcome their doubts and vacillations. It is only provided we adopt a patient attitude towards their inevitable vacillations, it is only with the political help of the proletariat, that they will be able to rise to a higher level of revolutionary consciousness and activity.

Fourth, it depends on whether the revolutionary proletariat exercises vigilance and takes action at the proper time. It must not allow fascism to catch it unawares, it must not surrender the initiative to fascism, it must inflict decisive blows on the latter before it can gather its forces, it must not allow fascism to consolidate its position, it must repel fascism wherever and whenever it manifests itself, it must not allow fascism to gain new positions—all of which the French proletariat is doing so successfully. (*Applause.*)

These are the main conditions for preventing the growth of fascism and its accession to power.

FASCISM—A FEROCIOUS BUT UNSTABLE POWER

The fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is a ferocious power, but an unstable one.

What are the chief causes of the instability of the fascist dictatorship?

While fascism has undertaken to overcome the discord and antagonisms within the bourgeois camp, it is rendering these antagonisms even more acute. Fascism endeavors to establish its political monopoly by violently destroying other political parties. But the existence of the capitalist system, the existence of various classes and the accentuation of class contradictions inevitably tend to undermine and explode the political monopoly of fascism. This is not the case of a Soviet country, where the dictatorship of the proletariat is also realized by a party with a political monopoly, but where this political monopoly accords with the interest of millions of toilers and is increasingly being based on the construction of classless society. In a fascist country the party of the fascists cannot preserve its monopoly for long, because it cannot set itself the aim of abolishing classes and class contradictions. It puts an end to the legal existence of bourgeois parties. But a number of them continue to maintain an illegal existence, while the Communist Party even in conditions of illegality continues to make progress, becomes steeled and tempered and leads the struggle of the proletariat against the fascist dictatorship. Hence, under the blows of class contradictions, the political monopoly of fascism is bound to explode.

Another reason for the instability of the fascist dictatorship is that the contrast between the anti-capitalist demagoguery of fascism and its policy of enriching the monopolist bourgeoisie in the most piratical fashion makes it easier to expose the class nature of fascism and tends to shake and narrow its mass basis.

Furthermore, the success of fascism arouses the profound hatred and indignation of the masses, helps to revolutionize them and provides a powerful stimulus for a united front of the proletariat against fascism.

By conducting a policy of economic nationalism (autarchy) and by seizing the greater portion of the national income for the purpose of preparing for war, fascism undermines the whole economic life of the country and accentuates the econo-

mic war between the capitalist states. It leads the conflicts that arise among the bourgeoisie the character of sharp and, at times bloody collisions, which undermines the stability of the fascist state power in the eyes of the people. A government which murders its own followers, as was the case in Germany on June 30 of last year, a fascist government against which another section of the fascist bourgeoisie is conducting an armed fight (the National-Socialist *putsch* in Austria and the violent attacks of individual fascist groups on the fascist governments in Poland, Bulgaria, Finland and other countries) —a government of this character cannot for long maintain its authority in the eyes of the broad petty-bourgeois masses.

The working class must be able to take advantage of the antagonisms and conflicts within the bourgeois camp, but it must not cherish the illusion that fascism will exhaust itself of its own accord. Fascism will not collapse automatically. It is only the revolutionary activity of the working class which can help to take advantage of the conflict which inevitably arise within the bourgeois camp in order to undermine the fascist dictatorship and to overthrow it.

By destroying the relics of bourgeois democracy, by elevating open violence to a system of government, fascism shakes democratic illusions and undermines the authority of the law in the eyes of the toiling masses. This is particularly the case in countries such as, for example, Austria and Spain, where the workers have taken up arms against fascism. In Austria, the heroic struggle of the *Schutzbund* and the Communists, in spite of their defeat, from the very outset shook the stability of the fascist dictatorship. In Spain, the bourgeoisie did not succeed in placing the fascist muzzle on the toilers. The armed struggles in Austria and Spain have resulted in ever wider masses of the working class coming to realize the necessity for a revolutionary class struggle.

Only such monstrous philistines, such lackeys of the bourgeoisie, as the superannuated theoretician of the Second International, Karl Kautsky, are capable of casting reproaches at the workers, to the effect that they should not have taken up arms in Austria and Spain. What would the working class movement in Austria and Spain look like today if the working class of these countries were guided by the treacherous counsels of the Kautskys? The working class would be experiencing profound demoralization in its ranks!

• "The school of civil war," Lenin says, "does not leave the people unaffected. It is a harsh school, and its complete curriculum *inevitably* includes the victories of the counter-revolution, the debaucheries of enraged reactionaries, savage punishments meted out by the old governments to the rebels, etc. But only downright pedants and mentally decrepit mummies can grieve over the fact that nations are entering this painful school; this school teaches the oppressed classes how to conduct civil war; it teaches how to bring about a victorious revolution; it concentrates in the masses of present-day slaves that hatred which is always harbored by the downtrodden, dull, ignorant slaves, and which leads those slaves who have become conscious of the shame of their slavery to the greatest historic exploits."*

The success of fascism in Germany has, as we know, been followed by a new wave of fascist onslaughts, which, in Austria, led to the provocation by Dollfuss, in Spain to the new onslaughts of the counter-revolutionaries on the revolutionary conquests of the masses, in Poland to the fascist reform of the constitution, while in France it spurred the armed detachments of the fascists to attempt a *coup d'état* in February 1934. But this victory, and the frenzy of the fascist dictatorship, called forth a counter-movement for a united proletarian front against fascism on an international scale. The burning of the Reichstag, which served as a signal for the general attack of fascism on the working class, the seizure and spoliation of the trade unions and the other working class organizations, the groans of the tortured anti-fascists rising from the vaults of the fascist barracks and concentration camps, are making it clear to the masses what has been the outcome of the reactionary, disruptive role played by the German Social-Democratic leaders, who rejected the proposal made by the Communists for a joint struggle against advancing fascism. They are convincing the masses of the necessity of amalgamating all the forces of the working class for the overthrow of fascism.

Hitler's victory also provided a decisive stimulus to the creation of a united front of the working class against fascism in France. Hitler's victory not only aroused in the workers the fear of the fate that befell the German workers, not only inflamed hatred for the executioners of their German class brothers, but also strengthened in them the determination

*Lenin, "Inflammable Material in World Politics," *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 298.

never in any circumstances to allow in their country what had happened to the working class in Germany.

The powerful urge towards the united front in all the capitalist countries shows that the lessons of defeat have not been in vain. The working class is beginning to act in a *new way*. The initiative shown by the Communist Party in the organization of the united front and the supreme self-sacrifice displayed by the Communists, by the revolutionary workers in the struggle against fascism have resulted in an unprecedented increase in the prestige of the Communist International. At the same time, within the Second International, a profound crisis has been developing, which has manifested itself with particular clarity and has become particularly accentuated since the bankruptcy of German Social-Democracy.

The Social-Democratic workers are able to convince themselves ever more forcibly that fascist Germany, with all its horrors and barbarities, is in the final analysis *the result of the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie*. These masses are coming ever more clearly to realize that the path along which the German Social-Democratic leaders led the proletariat must not again be traversed. Never has there been such ideological dissension in the camp of the Second International as at the present time. A process of differentiation is taking place in all the Social-Democratic parties. Within their ranks *two principal camps* are forming : side by side with the existing camp of reactionary elements, who are trying in every way to preserve the *bloc* between the Social-Democrats and the bourgeoisie, and who furiously reject a united front with the Communists, *there is beginning to form a camp of revolutionary elements who entertain doubts as to the correctness of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, who are in favour of the creation of a united front with the Communists and who are increasingly coming to adopt the position of the revolutionary class struggle.*

Thus fascism, which appeared as the result of the decline of the capitalist system, in the long run acts as a factor of its *further disintegration*. Thus fascism, which has undertaken to bury Marxism, the revolutionary movement of the working class, is, as a result of the dialectics of life and the class struggle, itself leading to the *further development of those forces* which are bound to serve as its grave-diggers, the grave-diggers of capitalism. (Applause.)

II. UNITED FRONT OF THE WORKING CLASS AGAINST FASCISM

COMRADES, millions of workers and toilers of the capitalist countries ask the question: How can fascism be prevented from coming to power and how can fascism be overthrown after it has been victorious? To this the Communist International replies: *The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to commence, is to form a united front, to establish unity of action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every region, in every country, all over the world. Unity of action of the proletariat on a national and international scale is the mighty weapon which renders the working class capable not only of successful defense but also of successful counter-offensive against fascism, against the class enemy.*

IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED FRONT

Is it not clear that joint action by the adherents of the parties and organizations of the two Internationals, the Communist and the Second International, would facilitate the repulse by the masses of the fascist onslaught, and would enhance the political importance of the working class?

Joint action by the parties of both Internationals against fascism, however, would not be confined to influencing their present adherents, the Communists and Social-Democrats; it would also exert a powerful influence on the ranks of the *Catholic, anarchist and unorganized workers, even on those who had temporarily become the victims of fascist demagoguery.*

Moreover, a powerful united front of the proletariat would exert tremendous influence on *all other strata of the toiling people, on the peasantry, on the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia.* A united front would inspire the wavering groups with faith in the strength of the working class.

But even this is not all. The proletariat of the imperialist countries has possible allies not only in the toilers of its own countries but also in the *oppressed nations of the colonies and semi-colonies.* Inasmuch as the proletariat is split both nationally and internationally, inasmuch as one of its parts supports

the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, in particular its system of oppression in the colonies and semi-colonies, this alienates from the working class the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies and weakens the world anti-imperialist front. Every step on the road to unity of action, directed towards the support of the struggle for the liberation of the colonial peoples on the part of the proletariat of the imperialist countries, denotes the transformation of the colonies and semi-colonies into one of the most important reserves of the world proletariat.

If finally we take into consideration that international unity of action by the proletariat relies on the *steadily growing strength of a proletarian state, a land of Socialism, the Soviet Union*, we see what broad perspective are revealed by the realization of united action on the part of the proletariat on a national and international scale. The establishment of unity of action by all sections of the working class, irrespective of their party or organizational affiliation, is necessary *even before the majority of the working class is united in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the proletarian revolution.*

Is it possible to realize this unity of action by the proletariat in the individual countries and throughout the whole world? Yes, it is. And it is possible at this very moment. The Communist International *attaches no conditions to unity of action except one, and that an elementary condition acceptable for all workers, viz., that the unity of action be directed against fascism, against the offensive of capital, against the threat of war, against the class enemy.* This is our condition.

THE CHIEF ARGUMENTS OF THE OPPONENTS OF THE UNITED FRONT

What objections can the opponents of the united front have and how do they voice their objections?

Some say: "To the Communists the slogan of the united front is merely a manoeuvre." But if it is a manoeuvre, we reply, why don't you expose the "Communist manoeuvre" by your honest participation in a united front? We declare frankly: "We want unity of action by the working class, so that the proletariat may grow strong in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, in order that while defending today its current interests against attacking capital, against fascism, the pro-

proletariat may be in a position tomorrow to create the preliminary conditions for its final emancipation."

"The Communists attack us," say others. But listen, we have repeatedly declared: We shall not attack anyone, neither persons nor organizations nor parties, that stand for the united front of the working class against the class enemy. But at the same time it is our duty, in the interests of the proletariat and its cause, to criticize those persons, those organizations, those parties which impede unity of action by the workers.

"We cannot form a united front with the Communists, since they have a different programme," says a third group. But you yourselves say that your programme differs from the programme of the bourgeois parties, and yet this did not and does not prevent you from entering into coalitions with these parties.

"The bourgeois-democratic parties are better allies against fascism than the Communists," say the opponents of the united front and the advocates of coalition with the bourgeoisie. But what does Germany's experience teach? Did not the Social-Democrats form a bloc with those "better" allies? And what were the results?

"If we establish a united front with the Communists, the petty bourgeoisie will take fright at the 'Red danger' and will desert to the fascists," we hear it said quite frequently. But does the united front represent a threat to the peasants, the petty traders, the artisans, the toiling intellectuals? No, the united front is a threat to the big bourgeoisie, the financial magnates, the *Junkers* and other exploiters, whose regime brings complete ruin to all these strata.

"Social-Democracy is for democracy, the Communists are for dictatorship; therefore we cannot form a united front with the Communists," say some of the Social-Democratic leaders. But are we offering you now a united front for the purpose of proclaiming the dictatorship of the proletariat? We make no such proposal for the time being.

"Let the Communists recognize democracy, let them come out in its defense, then we shall be ready for a united front." To this we reply: We are adherents of Soviet democracy, the democracy of the toilers, the most consistent democracy in the world. But in the capitalist countries we defend and shall continue to defend every inch of bourgeois-democratic liberties which are being attacked by fascism and bourgeois reaction,

because the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat so dictate.

"But the tiny Communist Parties do not contribute anything by participating in the united front brought about by the Labour Party," say, for instance, the Labour leaders of Great Britain. Recall how the Austrian Social-Democratic leaders said the same things with reference to the small Austrian Communist Party. And what have events shown? It was not the Austrian Social-Democratic Party headed by Otto Bauer and Karl Renner that proved right, but the tiny Austrian Communist Party which at the right moment signalled the fascist danger in Austria and called upon the workers to struggle. For the whole experience of the labour movement has shown that the Communists with all their relative insignificance in numbers are the motive power of the militant activity of the proletariat. Besides this, it must not be forgotten that the Communist Parties of Austria or Great Britain are not only the tens of thousands of workers who are supporters of the Party, but are *parts* of the world Communist movement, are *Sections of the Communist International*, the leading party of which is the party of a proletariat which has already achieved victory and rules over one-sixth part of the globe.

"But the united front did not prevent fascism from being victorious in the Saar," is another objection advanced by the opponents of the united front. Strange is the logic of these gentlemen! First they leave no stone unturned to ensure the victory of fascism and then they rejoice with malicious glee because the united front which they entered into only at the last moment did not lead to the victory of the workers.

"If we were to form a united front with the Communists, we should have to withdraw from the coalition, and reactionary and fascist parties would enter the government," say the Social-Democratic leaders holding cabinet posts in various countries. Very well. Was not the German Social-Democratic Party in a coalition government? It was. Was not the Austrian Social-Democratic Party in office? It was. Were not the Spanish Socialists in the same government as the bourgeoisie? They were, too. Did the participation of the Social-Democratic Parties in the bourgeois coalition governments in these countries prevent fascism from attacking the proletariat? It did not. Consequently it is as clear as daylight that participation of Social-Democratic ministers in bourgeois governments is *not* a barrier to fascism.

• “The Communists act like dictators, they want to prescribe and dictate everything to us.” No. We prescribe nothing and dictate nothing. We only make proposals concerning which we are convinced that if realized they will meet the interests of the toiling people. This is not only the right but the duty of all those acting in the name of the workers. You are afraid of the “dictatorship” of the Communists? Let us jointly submit all proposals to the workers, both yours and ours, jointly discuss them and choose, together with all the workers, those proposals which are most useful to the cause of the working class.

Thus all these arguments against the united front *will not bear the slightest criticism*. They are rather the flimsy excuses of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy, who prefer their united front with the bourgeoisie to the united front of the proletariat.

No. These excuses will not hold water. The international proletariat has known all the bitterness of tribulation caused by the split in the working class, and becomes more and more convinced that *the united front, that the proletariat's unity of action on a national and international scale are both necessary and perfectly possible*. (Applause.)

CONTENT AND FORMS OF THE UNITED FRONT

What is and ought to be the basic content of the united front at the present stage? The defense of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defense of the working class against fascism, must form the *starting point and main content* of the united front in all capitalist countries.

We must not confine ourselves to bare appeals to struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, but must also find and advance those slogans and forms of struggle which arise out of the vital needs of the masses, and are commensurate with their fighting capacity at the given stage of development.

We must point out to the masses what they must do *today* to defend themselves against capitalist spoliation and fascist barbarity.

We must strive to establish the widest united front with the aid of joint action by workers' organizations of different trends for the defense of the vital interests of the toiling masses. This means:

First, joint struggle really to shift the burden of the consequences of the crisis on the shoulders of the ruling classes, the shoulders of the capitalists, landlords—in a word, to the shoulders of the rich.

Second, joint struggle against all forms of the fascist offensive, in defense of the gains and the rights of the toilers, against the liquidation of bourgeois-democratic liberties.

Third, joint struggle against the approaching danger of imperialist war, a struggle that will impede the preparations for such a war.

We must indefatigably prepare the working class for a *rapid change in forms and methods of struggle* when there is a change in the situation. As the movement grows and the unity of the working class strengthens, we must go further, and prepare the transition *from the defensive to the offensive against capital*, steering towards the *organization of a mass political strike*. It must be an absolute condition of such a strike to draw into it the main trade unions of the respective countries.

Communists of course cannot and must not for a moment abandon their own *independent work* of Communist education, organization and mobilization of the masses. However, for the purpose of ensuring that the workers find the road to unity of action, it is necessary to strive at the same time both for short-term and for long-term agreements providing for *joint action with Social-Democratic Parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the toilers* against the class enemies of the proletariat. The chief stress in all this must be laid on developing *mass action* locally, *to be carried out by the local organizations* through local agreements.

While loyally carrying out the conditions of all agreements made with them, we shall mercilessly expose all sabotage of joint action on the part of persons and organizations participating in the united front. To any attempt to wreck the agreements—and such attempts may possibly be made—we shall reply by appealing to the masses while continuing untiringly to struggle for the restoration of the broken unity of action.

It goes without saying that the concrete realization of the united front will take *various* forms in various countries, depending upon the condition and character of the workers' organizations and their political level, upon the concrete situation in the particular country, upon the changes in progress in the international labour movement, etc.

These forms may include for instance: co-ordinated joint

action of the workers to be agreed upon *from case to case* on definite occasions, on individual demands or on the basis of a common platform; co-ordinated actions in *individual enterprises* or by *whole industries*; co-ordinated actions on a *local, regional, national* or *international* scale; co-ordinated actions for the organization of the economic struggle of the workers, carrying out of mass political actions, for the organization of joint self-defense against fascist attacks; co-ordinated action in the rendering of aid to political prisoners and their families, in the field of struggle against social reaction; joint actions in the defense of the interests of the youth and women, in the field of the co-operative movement, cultural activity, sports, etc.

It would be insufficient to content ourselves with the conclusion of a pact providing for joint action and the formation of contact committees consisting of the parties and organizations participating in the united front, like those we have in France, for instance. That is only the first step. The pact is an auxiliary means for realizing joint action, but by itself it does not constitute a united front. A contact commission between the leaders of the Communist and Socialist parties is necessary to facilitate the carrying out of joint action, but by itself it is far from adequate for a real development of the united front, for drawing the broadest masses into the struggle against fascism.

The Communists and all revolutionary workers must strive for the formation of elective (and in the countries of fascist dictatorship—selected from the most authoritative participants in the united front movement) *non-partisan class bodies* of the united front at the factories, among the unemployed, in the working class districts, among the small townsmen and in the villages. Only such bodies will be able to embrace in the united front movement the vast masses of unorganized toilers as well, will be able to assist in developing the initiative of the masses in the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and reaction, and on this basis to create the necessary *broad active rank and file* of the united front, the training of hundreds and thousands of non-Party Bolsheviks in the capitalist countries.

Joint action of the organized workers is the beginning, the foundation. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the unorganized masses constitute the vast majority of workers. Thus, in France the number of organized workers—Commun-

ists, Socialists, trade union members of various trends—is altogether about one million, while the total number of workers is eleven million. In Great Britain there are approximately five million members of trade unions and parties of various trends. At the same time the total number of workers is fourteen million. In the United States of America about five million workers are organized, while altogether there are thirty-eight million workers in that country. About the same ratio holds good for a number of other countries. In “normal” times this mass in the main does not participate in political life. But now this gigantic mass is getting into motion more and more, is being brought into political life, comes out in the political arena.

The creation of non-partisan class bodies is the best form for carrying out, extending and strengthening the united front among the rank and file of the broadest masses. These bodies will likewise be the best bulwark against every attempt of the opponents of the united front to disrupt the established unity of action of the working class.

THE ANTI-FASCIST PEOPLE'S FRONT

In the mobilization of the toiling masses for the struggle against fascism, the formation of a broad people's anti-fascist front on the basis of the proletarian united front is a particularly important task. The success of the entire struggle of the proletariat is closely connected with the establishment of a fighting alliance between the proletariat on the one hand and the toiling peasantry and the basic mass of the urban petty bourgeoisie constituting a majority in the population of even industrially developed countries, on the other.

In its agitation, fascism, desirous of winning these masses to its own side, tries to set the toiling masses of the cities and the countryside against the revolutionary proletariat, intimidating the petty bourgeoisie with the bugaboo of the “Red danger.” We must turn the spearpoint in the opposite direction and show the toiling peasants, artisans and toiling intellectuals whence the real danger threatens. We must show them concretely who piles the burden of taxes and imposts on to the peasant, squeezes usurious interest out of him, and who, while owning the best lands and enjoying every form of wealth, drives the peasant and his family from his plot of land and dooms him to unemployment and poverty. We must explain

concretely, explain patiently and persistently, who ruins the artisans, the handicraftsmen, with taxes, imposts, high rents and competition impossible for them to withstand, who throws into the street and deprives of employment the broad masses of the toiling intelligentsia.

But this is *not enough*.

The fundamental, the most decisive point in establishing the anti-fascist people's front is *the resolute action of the revolutionary proletariat* in defense of the demand of these strata, particularly of the toiling peasantry, demands in line with the basic interests of the proletariat, combining in the process of struggle the demands of the working class with these demands.

In forming the anti-fascist people's front, a correct approach to those organizations and parties to which a considerable number of the toiling peasantry and the mass of the urban petty bourgeoisie belong is of great importance.

In the capitalist countries the majority of these parties and organizations, political as well as economic, are still under the influence of the bourgeoisie and follow it. The social composition of these parties and organizations is heterogeneous. They include big kulaks (rich peasants) side by side with landless peasants, big business men alongside of petty shopkeepers, but control is in the hands of the former, the agents of big capital. This makes it our duty to *approach* these organizations in *different ways*, taking into consideration that not infrequently the bulk of the members does not know anything about the real political character of its leadership. Under certain conditions, we can and must bend our efforts to the task of drawing these parties and organizations or certain sections of them to the side of the anti-fascist people's front, despite their bourgeois leadership. Such, for instance, is today the situation in France with the Radical Party, in the United States with various farmers' organizations, in Poland with the "Stronnictwo Ludowe," in Yugoslavia with the Croatian Peasants' Party, in Bulgaria with the Agrarian League, in Greece with the Agrarians, etc. But irrespective of whether there is any chance of attracting these parties and organizations to the side of the people's front, our tactics must *under all circumstances* be directed towards drawing the small peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen, etc., among their members into the anti-fascist people's front.

You see consequently that in this field we must put an end all along the line to what frequently occurs in our practical

work—the ignoring of or contemptuous attitude towards the various organizations and parties of the peasants, artisans and urban petty-bourgeois masses.

CARDINAL QUESTIONS OF THE UNITED FRONT IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

There are in every country certain *cardinal questions* which at the present stage are agitating vast masses of the population and around which the struggle for the establishment of the united front must be developed. If these cardinal points, cardinal questions, are properly grasped, it will ensure and accelerate the establishment of the united front.

A. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Let us take, for example, so important a country in the capitalist world as the *United States of America*. There millions of people have been brought into motion by the crisis. The programme for the recovery of capitalism has collapsed. Vast masses are beginning to abandon the bourgeois parties, and are at present at the crossroads.

Incipient American fascism is endeavouring to direct the disillusionment and discontent of these masses into reactionary fascist channels. It is a peculiarity of the development of American fascism that at the present stage it appears principally in the guise of an opposition to fascism, which it accuses of being an “un-American” tendency imported from abroad. In contradistinction to German fascism, which acts under anti-constitutional slogans, American fascism tries to portray itself as the custodian of the constitution and “American democracy”. It does not yet represent a directly menacing force. But if it succeeds in penetrating to the broad masses who have become disillusioned with the old bourgeois parties, it may become a serious menace in the very near future.

And what would the success of fascism in the United States entail? For the toiling masses it would, of course, entail the unrestrained strengthening of the regime of exploitation and the destruction of the working class movement. And what would be the international significance of this success of fascism? As we know, the United States is not Hungary or Finland, or Bulgaria, or Latvia. The success of fascism in the United States would change the whole international situation quite materially.

Under these circumstances, can the American proletariat

content itself with the organization of only its class conscious Vanguard, which is prepared to follow the revolutionary path ?
No.

It is perfectly obvious that the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces dissociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay. It must at the proper time find ways and suitable forms of preventing fascism from winning over the broad discontented masses of the toilers. And here it must be said that under American conditions the creation of a mass party of toilers, a "*Workers' and Farmers' Party*," might serve as such a suitable form. *Such a party would be a specific form of the mass people's front in America* that should be set up in opposition to the parties of the trusts and the banks, and likewise to growing fascism. Such a party, of course, will be *neither* Socialist nor communist. But it *must* be an anti-fascist party and must *not* be an anti-Communist party. The programme of this party must be directed against the banks, trusts and monopolies, against the principal enemies of the people who are gambling on its misfortunes. Such a party will be equal to its task only if it defends the urgent demands of the working class, only if it fights for genuine social legislation, for unemployment insurance ; only if it fights for land for the white and black sharecroppers and for their liberation from the burden of debt ; only if it works for the cancellation of the farmers' indebtedness ; only if it fights for the equal status of the Negroes ; only if it fights for the members of the liberal professions, the small business men, the artisans. And so on.

It goes without saying that such a party will fight for the election of its own candidates to local offices, to the state legislatures, to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Our comrades in the United States acted rightly in taking the initiative for the creation of such a party. But they still have to take effective measures in order to make the creation of such a party the cause of the masses themselves. The question of forming a "*Workers' and Farmers' Party*," and its programme, should be discussed at mass meetings of the people. We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it. In no case must the initiative of organizing the party be allowed to pass to elements desirous of utilizing the discontent of the masses which have become disillusioned in both the bourgeois parties, Democratic and Republican, in order to create a "third party"

in the United States, as an anti-Communist party, a party directed against the revolutionary movement.

B. GREAT BRITAIN

In Great Britain, as a result of the mass action of the British workers, Mosley's fascist organization has for the time being been pushed into the background. But we must not close our eyes to the fact that the so-called "National Government" is passing a number of reactionary measures directed against the working class, as a result of which conditions are being created in Great Britain, too, which will make it easy for the bourgeoisie, if necessary, to proceed to a fascist regime. At the present stage, fighting the fascist danger in Great Britain means primarily fighting the "National Government" and its reactionary measures, fighting the offensive of capital, fighting for the demands of the unemployed, fighting against wage reductions and for the repeal of all those laws with the help of which the British bourgeoisie is lowering the standard of living of the masses.

But the growing hatred of the working class for the "National Government" is uniting increasingly large numbers under the slogan of the formation of a *new Labour Government* in Great Britain. Can the Communists ignore this frame of mind of the masses, who still retain faith in a Labour Government? No, comrades. We must find a way of approaching these masses. We tell them openly, as did the Thirteenth Congress of the British Communist Party, that we Communists are in favour of a Soviet government, as the only form of government capable of emancipating the workers from the yoke of capital. But you want a Labour Government? Very well. We have been and are fighting hand in hand with you for the defeat of the "National Government." We are prepared to support your fight for the formation of a *new Labour Government*, in spite of the fact that both the previous Labour Governments did not fulfil the promises made to the working class by the Labour Party. We do not expect this government to carry out Socialist measures. But *we shall present it with the demand*, in the name of the working class millions, that it defend the most essential economic and political interests of the working class and of all the toilers. Let us jointly discuss a common programme of such demands, and let us achieve that unity of action which the proletariat requires in order to

repel the reactionary offensive of the "National Government", the attack of capital and fascism, and the preparations for a new war. On this basis, the British comrades are prepared at the forthcoming parliamentary elections to co-operate with branches of the Labour Party against the "National Government," and also against Lloyd George, who is endeavouring in his own way to lure the masses into following him against the cause of the working class and in the interests of the British bourgeoisie.

This position of the British Communists is a correct one. It will help them to set up a militant united front with the millions of members of the British trade unions and the British Labour Party.

While always remaining in the front ranks of the fighting proletariat, and pointing out to the masses the only right path—the path of struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a Soviet government—the Communists, in defining their immediate political aims, must not attempt to leap over those necessary stages of the mass movement in the course of which the working class masses by their own experience outlive their illusions and pass over to the side of Communism.

C. FRANCE

France, as we know, is a country in which the working class is setting an example to the whole world proletariat of how to fight fascism. The French Communist Party is setting an example to all the sections of the Comintern of how the tactics of the united front should be conducted; the Socialist workers are setting an example of what the Social-Democratic workers of other capitalist countries should now be doing in the fight against fascism. (*Applause.*) The significance of the anti-fascist demonstration attended by half a million people held in Paris on July 14 of this year and of the numerous demonstrations in other French cities is tremendous. This is not merely a movement of a united working class front; it is the beginning of a wide general front of the people against fascism in France.

This united front movement enhances the confidence of the working class in its own forces; it strengthens its consciousness of the leading role it is playing in relation to the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and the intelligentsia;

it extends the influence of the Communist Party among the working class masses, and therefore brings new strength to the proletariat in the fight against fascism. It is mobilizing in good time the vigilance of the masses in regard to the fascist danger. And it will serve as an infectious example for the development of the anti-fascist struggle in other capitalist countries and will exercise a heartening influence on the proletarians of Germany crushed down by the fascist dictatorship.

The victory, needless to say, is a big one, but it still does not decide the issue of the anti-fascist struggle. The overwhelming majority of the French people are undoubtedly opposed to fascism. But the bourgeoisie is able by armed force to violate the will of peoples. The fascist movement is continuing to develop absolutely freely, with the active support of monopoly capital, the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie, the general staff of the French army, and the reactionary leaders of the Catholic church—that stronghold of all reaction. The most powerful fascist organizations, the *Croix de Feu*, now commands 300,000 armed men, the backbone of which consists of 60,000 officers of the reserve. It holds strong positions in the police, the gendarmerie, the army, the air force and in all government offices. The recent municipal elections have shown that in France it is not only the revolutionary forces that are growing, but also the forces of fascism. If fascism succeeds in penetrating widely among the peasantry, and in securing the support of one section of the army, while the other section remains neutral, the French toiling masses will not be able to prevent the fascists from coming to power. Comrades, do not forget the organizational weakness of the French labour movement, which tends to facilitate the success of the fascist attack. The working class and all anti-fascists in France have no grounds for resting content with the results already achieved.

What are the tasks confronting the working class in France?

First, to achieve the establishment of a united front not only in the political sphere, but also in the economic sphere in order to organize the struggle against the capitalist offensive, and by its pressure to smash the resistance offered to the united front by the leaders of the reformist Confederation of Labour.

Second, to achieve trade union unity in France—united trade unions based on the class struggle.

Third, to enlist in the anti-fascist movement the broad

peasant masses, the petty-bourgeois masses, devoting special attention in the programme of the anti-fascist people's front to their urgent demands.

Fourth, to strengthen organizationally and extend further the anti-fascist movement which has already developed, by the widespread creation of elected non-partisan bodies of the anti-fascist people's front, the influence of which extends to wider masses than those in the parties and toilers' organizations in France at present in existence.

Fifth, to secure by their pressure the disbanding and disarming of the fascist organizations, as organizations of conspirators against the republic and agents of Hitler in France.

Sixth, to achieve the purging of the State apparatus, the army and the police of the conspirators who are preparing a fascist coup.

Seventh, to develop the struggle against the leaders of the reactionary cliques of the Catholic church, as one of the most important strongholds of French fascism.

Eighth, to link up the army with the anti-fascist movement by creating in its ranks committees for the defense of the republic and the constitution, directed against those who want to utilize the army for an anti-constitutional coup d'etat (applause) not to allow the reactionary forces in France to wreck the Franco-Soviet agreement, which defends the cause of peace against the aggression of German fascism. (Applause.)

And if in France the anti-fascist movement leads to the formation of a government which will carry on a real struggle against French fascism—not in word but in deed—will carry out the programme of demands of the anti-fascist people's front, the Communists, *while remaining* the irreconcilable foes of every bourgeois government and supporters of a Soviet government, will nevertheless, in face of the growing fascist danger, *be prepared to support such a government.* (Applause.)

THE UNITED FRONT AND THE FASCIST MASS ORGANIZATIONS

Comrades, the fight for the establishment of a united front in countries where the fascists are in power is perhaps the most important problem that confronts us. In such countries, of course, the fight is carried on under far more difficult conditions than is the case in countries which have legal labour movements. Nevertheless, all the conditions exist in fascist

countries for the development of a real anti-fascist people's front in the struggle against the fascist dictatorship, since the Social-Democrats, Catholic and other workers, in Germany for instance, are in a position to realize more directly the necessity for a joint struggle with the Communists against the fascist dictatorship. Wide strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, having already tasted the bitter fruits of fascist rule, are growing increasingly discontented and disillusioned, which fact makes it easier to enlist them in the anti-fascist people's front.

But the principal task in fascist countries, particularly in Germany, and Italy, where fascism has managed to gain a mass basis and has forced the workers and other toilers into its organizations, consists in a skilful combination of the struggle against the fascist dictatorship from without and its undermining from within, inside the fascist mass organizations and bodies. Special methods and means of approach suited to the concrete conditions prevailing in these countries must be learned, mastered and applied, so as to facilitate the rapid disintegration of the mass basis of fascism and to prepare the way for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. We must learn, master and apply this, and not only shout "Down with Hitler!" and "Down with Mussolini!" Yes, learn, master and apply.

This is a difficult and complex task. It is all the more difficult because our experience in successfully combating the fascist dictatorship is extremely limited. Our Italian comrades, for instance, have already been fighting under the conditions of a fascist dictatorship for about thirteen years. Nevertheless, they have not succeeded in developing a real mass struggle against fascism, and therefore they have unfortunately been little able in this respect to help the Communist Parties in other fascist countries by their positive experience.

The German and Italian Communists, and the Communists in other fascist countries, as well as the Communist youth, have displayed prodigies of valour; they have made and are daily making tremendous sacrifices. But heroism alone is not enough. (*Applause.*) Heroism must be combined with day-to-day work among the masses, with such concrete struggle against fascism as will achieve the most tangible results in this sphere. In our struggle against fascist dictatorship it is particularly dangerous to confuse the wish with the fact. We must base ourselves on the facts, on the actual concrete situation.

What is now the actual situation, in Germany for instance?

The masses are becoming increasingly discontented and disillusioned with the policy of the fascist dictatorship, and this even assumes the form of partial strikes and other action. In spite of all its efforts, fascism has failed to win over politically the basic masses of the workers; it is even losing its former supporters, and will lose them more and more in the future. Nevertheless, we must realize that the workers who are convinced of the possibility of overthrowing the fascist dictatorship, and who are prepared, already today, to fight for it actively are still in the minority—they consist of us, the Communists, and the revolutionary section of the Social-Democratic workers. But the majority of the toilers have not yet become aware of the real, concrete possibilities and methods of overthrowing this dictatorship and are maintaining a waiting position. This we must bear in mind when we outline our tasks in the struggle against fascism in Germany, and when we seek, study and apply special methods of bringing about the undermining and overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Germany.

In order to be able to strike a telling blow at the fascist dictatorship, we must first find out what is its most vulnerable point. What is the Achilles heel of the fascist dictatorship? Its social basis. The latter is extremely heterogeneous. It is made up of various classes and various strata of society. Fascism has proclaimed itself the sole representative of all classes and strata of the population: the manufacturer and the worker, the millionaire and the unemployed, Junker and the small peasant, the big capitalist and the artisan. It pretends to defend the interests of *all* these strata, the interests of the nation. But since it is a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, fascism must inevitably come into conflict with its mass social basis, all the more since, under the fascist dictatorship, the class contradictions between the pack of financial magnates and the overwhelming majority of the people are brought out in greatest relief.

We can lead the masses to a decisive struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship only by getting the workers who have been forced into the fascist organizations, or have joined them through ignorance, to take part in the *most elementary movements* for the defense of their economic, political and cultural interests. It is for this reason that the Communists must work in these organizations, as the best champions of the day-to-day interests of the mass of members, bear-

ing in mind that as the workers belonging to these organizations begin more and more frequently to demand their rights and defend their interests, they inevitably come into conflict with the fascist dictatorship.

In defending the urgent and, at first, the most elementary interests of the toiling masses of town and country, it is comparatively easier to find a common language not only with the conscious anti-fascists, but also with those toilers who are still supporters of fascism, but are disillusioned and dissatisfied with its policy, and are grumbling and seeking an occasion for expressing their discontent. We must in general realize that all our tactics in countries with a fascist dictatorship must be of such a character as not to repulse the rank-and-file supporters of fascism, not to throw them once more into the arms of fascism, but to deepen the chasm between the fascist leaders and the mass of disillusioned rank-and-file followers of fascism drawn from the toiling strata.

We need not be dismayed, comrades, if the people mobilized around these day-to-day interests consider themselves either indifferent to politics or even followers of fascism. The important thing for us to draw them into the movement which, although it may not at first proceed openly under the slogans of the struggle against fascism, is already objectively an anti-fascist movement counterposing these masses against the fascist dictatorship.

Experience teaches us that the view that it is *generally impossible*, in countries with a fascist dictatorship, to come out legally or semi-legally, is harmful and incorrect. To insist on this point of view means to fall into passivity, and to renounce real mass work altogether. True, under the conditions of a fascist dictatorship, to find forms and methods of legal or semi-legal action is a difficult and complex problem. But, as in many other questions, the path is indicated by life and by the initiative of the masses themselves, which have already provided us with a number of examples that must be generalized and applied in an organized and effective manner. We must very resolutely put an end to the tendency to underestimate work in the fascist mass organizations. In Italy, in Germany and in a number of other fascist countries, our comrades concealed their passivity, and frequently even their direct refusal to work in the fascist mass organizations, by putting work in the factories in contradistinction to work in the fascist mass organizations. In reality, however, it was just

this mechanical distinction which led to work being conducted very feebly, and sometimes not at all, both in the fascist mass organizations and in the factories.

Yet it is particularly important that Communists in the fascist countries should be wherever the masses are to be found. Fascism has deprived the workers of their own legal organizations. It has forced the fascist organizations upon them, and it is *there that the masses are* by compulsion, or to some extent voluntarily. These mass fascist organizations can and must be made our legal or semi-legal field of action, where we can meet the masses. They can and must be made our legal or semi-legal starting point for the defense of the day-to-day interests of the masses. In order to utilize these possibilities, Communists must strive to win elective posts in the fascist mass organizations, with the object of establishing contact with the masses, and must rid themselves once and for all of the prejudice that this kind of activity is unseemly and unworthy of a revolutionary worker.

In Germany, for instance, there exists a system known as shop delegates. But where is it stated that we must leave the fascists a monopoly in these organizations? Cannot we endeavour to unite the Communist, Social-Democratic, Catholic and other anti-fascist workers in the factories so that when the list of shop delegates is voted upon, the known agents of the employers may be struck off and other candidates, enjoying the confidence of the workers, inserted in their stead? Practice has already shown that this is possible.

And does not practice also go to show that it is possible, jointly with the Social-Democratic and other discontented workers, to demand that the shop delegates really defend the interests of the workers?

Take the "*Labour Front*" in Germany, or the fascist trade unions in Italy. Is it not possible to demand that the functionaries of the "*Labour Front*" be elected, and not appointed; to insist that the leading bodies of the local groups report to the meetings of the members of the organizations; to address these demands, following a decision by the group, to the employer, to the "guardian of labour," to the higher bodies of the "*Labour Front*"? This is possible, provided the revolutionary workers really work within the "*Labour Front*" and try to obtain posts in it.

Similar methods of work are possible and essential in other mass fascist organizations also—in the Hitler Youth Leagues,

in the sports organizations, in the *Kraft durch Freude* organizations, in the *Doppo Lavoro* in Italy, in the co-operatives, and so forth.

Comrades, you remember the ancient tale of the capture of Troy. Troy was inaccessible to the armies attacking her thanks to her impregnable walls. And the attacking army, after suffering many sacrifices, was unable to achieve victory until with the aid of the famous Trojan horse it managed to penetrate to the very heart of the enemy's camp.

We revolutionary workers, it appears to me, should not be shy about using the same tactics with regard to our fascist foe, who is defending himself against the people with the help of the living wall of his cutthroats. (*Applause.*)

He who fails to understand the necessity of applying such tactics in the case of fascism, he who regards such an approach as "humiliating", may be a most excellent comrade, but, if you will allow me to say so, he is a windbag and not a revolutionary, he will be unable to lead the masses to the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. (*Applause.*)

Growing up *outside and inside* the fascist organizations in Germany, Italy and the other countries in which fascism possesses a mass basis, the mass movement for a united front, starting with the advocacy of the most elementary requirements, changing its forms and watchwords of the struggle as that struggle extends and grows, will be the *battering ram* that will shatter the now seemingly (to many) impregnable fortress of the fascist dictatorship.

THE UNITED FRONT IN THE COUNTRIES WHERE THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS ARE IN OFFICE

The struggle for the establishment of the united front raises also another very important problem, the problem of the united front in countries where Social-Democratic governments, or coalition governments in which Socialists participate, are in power, as, for instance, in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Czechoslovakia and Belgium.

Our attitude of absolute opposition to Social-Democratic governments, which are governments of compromise with the bourgeoisie, is well known. But this notwithstanding, we do not regard the existence of a *Social-Democratic government* or a coalition government formed by a Social-Democratic party with bourgeois parties as an insurmountable obstacle for the estab-

ishment of a united front with the Social-Democrats on definite issues. We believe that in such a case too a united front for the defense of the vital interests of the toiling people and in the struggle against fascism is quite *possible* and *necessary*. It stands to reason that in countries where representatives of Social-Democratic parties take part in the government, the Social-Democratic leadership offers the greatest *resistance* to the proletarian united front. This is quite comprehensible. After all, they want to show the bourgeoisie that it is they who can keep the discontented working masses under control and prevent them from falling under the influence of Communism better and more skillfully than anyone else. The fact, however, that Social-Democratic ministers are opposed to the proletarian united front can by no means justify a situation in which *the Communists do nothing to establish a united front of the proletariat*.

Our comrades in the Scandinavian countries often follow the line of least resistance, *confining themselves to propaganda exposing the Social-Democratic government*. This is a mistake. In *Denmark*, for example, the Social-Democratic leaders have been in the government for the last ten years, and for ten years day in and day out the Communists have been reiterating that it is a bourgeois, a capitalist government. We have to assume that the Danish workers are acquainted with this propaganda. The fact that a considerable majority nevertheless vote for the Social-Democratic government party only goes to show that the exposure of the government on the part of the Communists by means of propaganda is *insufficient*. It does *not* prove, however, that these hundreds of thousands of workers are satisfied with all the government measures of the Social-Democratic ministers. No, they are *not satisfied* with the fact that by its so-called "crisis agreement" the Social-Democratic government assists the *big capitalists and land-owners* and *not the workers and poor peasants*. They are not satisfied with the decree issued by the government in January 1933, which deprived the workers of the *right to strike*. They are not satisfied with the project of the Social-Democratic leadership for a dangerous *anti-democratic electoral reform* (which would considerably reduce the number of deputies). I shall hardly be in error, comrades, if I state that 99 per cent of the Danish workers *do not approve* of these political steps taken by the Social-Democratic leaders and ministers.

Is it not possible for the Communists to call upon the trade

union and Social-Democratic organizations of Denmark to discuss some of these burning issues, to express their opinions on them and jointly come out for a proletarian united front with the object of obtaining the workers' demands? In October of last year, when our Danish comrades appealed to the trade unions to act against the reduction of unemployment relief and for the democratic rights of the trade unions, about a hundred local trade union organizations joined the united front.

In Sweden a Social-Democratic government is for the third time in power, but the Swedish Communists have for a long time refused to apply the united front tactics in practice. Why? Was it because they were opposed to the united front? No, in principle, of course, they were for the united front, for a united front *in general*, but they failed to understand in what circumstances, on what questions, in defense of what demands a proletarian united front could be successfully established, where and how to "hook on." A few months before the Social-Democratic Party formed its government, it advanced during the elections a platform containing demands which were the very thing to include in a platform of the proletarian united front. For example, the slogans "*Against customs duties*", "*Against militarization*", "*Make an end to the policy of delay in the question of unemployment insurance*", "*Grant adequate old age pensions*", "*Prohibit organizations like the 'Munch' corps*" (a fascist organization), "*Down with class legislation against the unions*" demanded by the bourgeois parties."

Over a million toilers of Sweden voted in 1932 for these demands advocated by the Social-Democrats and welcomed in 1933 the formation of a Social-Democratic government in the hope that now these demands would be realized. What could have been more natural in such a situation and what would have suited the working masses better than an appeal of the Communist Party to all Social-Democratic and trade union organizations to take joint action to secure these demands advanced by the Social-Democratic Party?

If we had succeeded in really mobilizing the broad masses, in welding the Social-Democratic and Communist workers' organizations into a united front to secure these demands which the Social-Democrats themselves had advanced, no one can doubt that the working class of Sweden would have gained thereby. The Social-Democratic ministers of Sweden, of course, would not have been very happy over it, for in that

case the government would have been compelled to meet at least some of these demands. At any rate, what has happened now, when the government instead of abolishing has *raised* some of the duties, instead of restricting militarism has enlarged the military budget, and instead of rejecting any legislation directed against the trade unions has itself introduced such a bill in Parliament, would not have happened. True, on the last issue the Communist Party of Sweden carried through a good mass campaign in the spirit of the proletarian united front with the result that in the end even the Social-Democratic parliamentary fraction felt constrained to vote against the government bill, and for the time being the bill has been defeated.

The *Norwegian* Communists were right in calling upon the organizations of the Labour Party to organize joint May Day demonstrations and in putting forward a number of demands which in the main coincided with the demands contained in the election platform of the Norwegian Labour Party. Although this step in favour of a united front was poorly prepared and the leadership of the Norwegian Labour Party opposed it, *united front demonstrations took place in thirty localities.*

Formerly many Communists used to be afraid that it would be opportunism on their part if they did not counter every partial demand of the Social-Democrats by demands of their own which were twice as radical. That was a naive mistake. If Social-Democrats, for instance, demanded the dissolution of the fascist organizations, there was no reason why we should add: "and the disbanding of the state police" (a demand which would be expedient under different circumstances). We should rather tell the Social-Democratic workers: We are ready to accept these demands of your party as demands of the proletarian united front and are ready to fight to the end for its realization. Let us join hands for the battle.

In *Czechoslovakia* also certain demands advanced by the Czech and the German Social-Democrats, and the reformist trade unions, can and should be utilized for the establishment of a united front of the working class. When the Social-Democrats, for instance, demand work for the unemployed, or the abolition of the laws restricting municipal self-government, as they have done ever since 1927, (these demands must be made concrete in each locality, in each district, and a fight must be carried on hand in hand with the Social-Democratic organizations for their actual realization. Or, when the Social-

Democratic parties thunder against the exponents of fascism in the state apparatus "in general," the proper thing to do is in each particular district to drag into light of day the particular local fascist spokesmen, and together with the Social-Democratic workers demand their removal from government employ.

In Belgium the leaders of the Socialist Party, with Emile Vandervelde at their head, have entered a coalition government. This "success" they have achieved thanks to their lengthy and extensive campaign for two main demands: (1) *the abolition of the emergency decree*, and (2) *the realization of the de Man plan*. The first issue is very important. The preceding government issued 150 reactionary emergency decrees, which are an extremely heavy burden on the toiling people. It was proposed to repeal them at once. Such was the demand of the Socialist Party. But have many of these emergency decrees been repealed by the new government? It has not rescinded a single one. It has only mollified somewhat a few of the emergency decrees in order to make a sort of "token payment" in settlement of the generous promises of the Belgian Socialist leaders (like that "token dollar" which some European powers proffered the U.S.A. in payment of the millions due as war debts).

As regards the realization of the widely advertised de Man plan, the matter has taken a turn quite unexpected by the Social-Democratic masses. The Socialist ministers announced that the *economic crisis must be overcome first*, and only those provisions of de Man's plan should be carried into effect which improve the position of the industrial capitalists and the banks; only thereafter would it be possible to adopt measures to improve the conditions of the workers. But *how long* must the workers wait for *their* share in the "benefits" promised them in the de Man plan? The Belgian bankers have already had their veritable *shower of gold*. The Belgian franc has been devaluated 28 per cent; by this manipulation the bankers were able to pocket 4,500,000,000 francs as their spoils at the expense of the wage earners and the savings of the small depositors. But how does this tally with the contents of the de Man plan? Why, if we are to believe the letter of the plan, it promises to "*prosecute monopolist abuses and speculative manipulations.*"

On the basis of the de Man plan, the government has appointed a commission to supervise the banks. But the com-

mission consists of bankers who can now gaily and lightly supervise themselves.

The de Man plan also promises a number of other good things, such as a "*shortening of the working day*," "*normalization of wages*", "*a minimum wage*", "*organization of an all-embracing system of social insurance*, greater convenience in living conditions through new *housing construction*" and so forth. These are all demands which we Communists can support. We should go to the labour organizations of Belgium and say to them: The capitalists have already received enough and even too much. Let us demand that the Social-Democratic ministers now carry out the promises they made to the workers. Let us get together in a *united front* for the *successful defense* of our interests. Minister Vandervelde, we support the demands on behalf of the workers contained in *your platform*; but we tell you frankly that we take these demands *seriously*, that we want action and not empty words, and therefore are uniting hundreds of thousands of workers *to struggle* for these demands!

Thus, in countries having Social-Democratic governments, the Communists ought to make use of appropriate individual demands taken from the platforms of the Social-Democratic parties themselves and of the election promises of the Social-Democratic ministers as the starting point for the realization of joint action with the Social-Democratic parties and organizations, so that they may afterwards the more easily develop a campaign for the establishment of a united front, but on the basis of other mass demands to be raised in the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of war.

It must further be borne in mind that if in general joint action with the Social-Democratic parties and organizations requires that the Communists exercise serious and substantiated criticism of Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and untiringly explain to the Social-Democratic workers in a comradely way the programme and slogans of Communism, in countries having Social-Democratic governments this task is of particular importance in the struggle for the united front.

THE STRUGGLE FOR TRADE UNION UNITY

Comrades, the most important stage in the consolidation of the united front must be the establishment of national and international trade union unity.

As you know, the disruptive tactics of the reformist leaders were applied most virulently in the trade unions. The reason for this is clear. Here their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie found its practical culmination directly in the factories, to the detriment of the vital interests of the working class. This, of course, gave rise to sharp criticism and resistance on the part of the revolutionary workers under the leadership of the Communists. That is why the struggle between Communism and reformism raged most fiercely in the trade unions.

The more difficult and complicated the situation became for capitalism, the more reactionary was the policy of the leaders of the Amsterdam unions and the more aggressive were their measures against all opposition elements within the trade unions. Even the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany and the intensified capitalist offensive in all capitalist countries failed to diminish their aggressiveness. Is it not a characteristic fact that in 1933 alone, most disgraceful circulars were issued in Great Britain, Holland, Belgium and Sweden, urging the expulsion of Communists and revolutionary workers from the trade unions?

The same year a circular was issued in Great Britain prohibiting the local branches of the trade unions from joining anti-war or other revolutionary organizations. That was a prelude to the notorious "black circular" of the Trade Union Congress General Council, which outlawed any trades council admitting delegates "directly or indirectly associated with Communist organizations." What is there left to be said of the leadership of the German trade unions, which applied unprecedented repressive measures against the revolutionary elements in the trade unions?

Yet we must base our tactics, not on the behaviour of individual leaders of the Amsterdam unions, no matter what difficulties their behaviour may cause the class struggle, but primarily on the question of *where the masses of workers are to be found*. And here we must openly declare that work in the trade unions is the sorest spot in the work of all Communist Parties. We must bring about a real change for the

better in trade union work and make the question of struggle for trade union unity the central issue.

"What constitutes the strength of Social-Democracy in the West?" asked Comrade Stalin ten years ago. Answering this question, he said :

"The fact that it has its support in the trade unions.

"What constitutes the weakness of our Communist Parties in the West ?

"The fact that they are not yet linked with the trade unions, and that certain elements within the Communist Parties do not wish to be linked with them.

"Hence, the main task of the Communist Parties of the West at the present time is to develop the campaign for unity in the trade-union movement and to bring it to its consummation ; to see to it that all Communists, without exception, join the trade unions, there to work systematically and patiently to strengthen the solidarity of the working class in its fight against capital, and thus attain the conditions that will enable the Communist Parties to rely upon the trade unions."*

Has this precept of Comrade Stalin's been followed ? No, comrades, it has not.

Ignoring the urge of the workers to join the trade unions, and faced with the difficulties of working within the Amsterdam unions, many of our comrades decided to pass by this complicated task. They invariably spoke of an organizational crisis in the Amsterdam unions, of the workers deserting the unions, but failed to notice that after some decline at the beginning of the world economic crisis, these unions later began to grow again. The peculiarity of the trade union movement has been precisely the fact that the attacks of the bourgeoisie on trade union rights, the attempts in a number of countries to unify the trade unions (Poland, Hungary, etc.), the curtailment of social insurance, and wage cuts, forced the workers notwithstanding the lack of resistance displayed by the reformist trade union leaders to rally still more closely around these unions, because the workers wanted and still want to see in the trade unions the militant champions of their vital class interests. This explains the fact that most of the Amsterdam unions in France, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, etc., have grown in membership during the last few years.

*Stalin, "The Results of the Work of the Fourteenth Conference of the R.C.P.," *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 160.

The American Federation of Labour has also considerably increased its membership in the past two years.

Had the German comrades better understood the problem of trade union work of which Comrade *Thaelmann* spoke on many occasions, we would undoubtedly have had a better situation in the trade unions than was the case at the time the fascist dictatorship was established. By the end of 1932 only about *ten per cent* of the Party members belonged to the free trade unions. This in spite of the fact that after the Sixth Congress of the Comintern the Communists took the lead in quite a number of strikes. Our comrades used to write in the press of the need to assign 30 per cent of our forces to work in the trade unions, but in reality activity was concentrated exclusively around the revolutionary trade union opposition which actually sought to replace the trade unions. And how about the period after Hitler's seizure of power? For two years many of our comrades stubbornly and systematically opposed the correct slogan of fighting for the re-establishment of the free unions.

I could cite similar examples about almost every other capitalist country.

But we already have the first serious achievements to our credit in the struggle for trade union unity in European countries. I have in mind little Austria, where on the initiative of the Communist Party a basis has been created for an illegal trade union movement. After the February battles the Social-Democrats, with Otto Bauer at the head, threw out the watchword: "The free unions can be re-established only after the downfall of fascism." The Communists applied themselves to the task of *re-establishing the trade unions*. Each phase of that work was a bit of the living united front of the Austrian proletariat. The successful re-establishment of the free trade unions in underground conditions was a serious blow to fascism. The Social-Democrats were at the parting of the ways. Some of them tried to negotiate with the government. Others, seeing our successes, created their own parallel illegal trade unions. But there could be only one road: *either capitulation to fascism, or towards trade union unity through joint struggle against fascism*. Under mass pressure, the wavering leadership of the parallel unions created by the former trade union leaders decided to agree to amalgamation. The basis of this amalgamation is irreconcilable struggle against the offensive of capitalism and fascism and the

guarantee of trade union democracy. We welcome this fact of the amalgamation of trade unions, which is the first of its kind since the formal split of the trade unions after the war and is therefore of *international importance*.

In *France* the united front has unquestionably served as a mighty impetus towards the establishment of trade union unity. The leaders of the General Confederation of Labour have hampered and still hamper in every way the realization of unity, countering the main issue of the class policy of the trade unions by raising issues of a subordinate and secondary or formal character. An unquestionable success in the struggle for trade union unity has been the establishment of *single unions* on a local scale, embracing, in the case of the railroad workers, for instance, approximately three-quarters of the membership of both trade unions.

We are definitely for the re-establishment of *trade union unity in each country and on an international scale*. We are for *one union in each industry*.

We stand for *one federation of trade unions in each country*. We are for *one international federation of trade unions organized according to industries*.

We stand for *one International of trade unions based on the class struggle*. We are for *united class trade unions as one of the major bulwarks of the working class against the offensive of capital and fascism*. Our only condition for uniting the trade unions is: *Struggle against capital, struggle against fascism, and internal trade union democracy*.

Time does not stand still. To us the question of trade union unity on a national as well as international scale is a question of the great task of uniting our class in mighty, single trade union organizations against the class enemy.

We welcome the fact that on the eve of May First of this year the Red International of Labour Unions addressed the Amsterdam International with the proposal to consider jointly the question of the terms, methods and forms of uniting the world trade union movement. The leaders of the Amsterdam International rejected that proposal using the stock argument that unity in the trade union movement is possible only within the Amsterdam International, which, by the way, includes almost none but trade unions in a number of European countries.

But the Communists working in the trade unions must continue to struggle indefatigably for the unity of the trade

union movement. The task of the Red trade unions and the R.I.L.U. is to do all in their power to hasten the hour of joint struggle of all trade unions against the offensive of capital and fascism, to establish a united trade union movement, despite the stubborn resistance of the reactionary leaders of the Amsterdam International. The Red trade unions and the R.I.L.U. must receive our unstinted support in this matter.

In countries where small Red trade unions exist we recommend to work for their affiliation with the big reformist unions, but to insist on the right to defend their views and on the reinstatement of expelled members. But in countries where big Red trade unions exist parallel with big reformist trade unions, we must work for the convening of *unity congresses* on the basis of platforms of struggle against the capitalist offensive and of ensuring *trade union democracy*.

It should be stated categorically that any Communist worker, any revolutionary worker who does not belong to the mass trade union of his industry, who does not fight to transform the reformist trade union into a real class trade union organization, who does not fight for trade union unity on the basis of the class struggle, such Communist worker, such revolutionary worker, does not discharge his elementary proletarian duty. (Applause.)

THE UNITED FRONT AND THE YOUTH

I have already pointed out the role which the drawing of the youth into the fascist organizations played in the victory of fascism. In speaking of the youth, we must state frankly that we have neglected our task of drawing the masses of the toiling youth into the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the danger of war; we have neglected these tasks in a number of countries. We have underestimated the enormous importance of the youth in the fight against fascism. We have not always taken count of the specific economic, political and cultural interests of the youth. We have likewise not paid proper attention to revolutionary education of the youth.

All this has been utilized very cleverly by fascism, which in some countries, particularly in Germany, has inveigled large sections of the youth on to the anti-proletarian road. It should be borne in mind that the glamour of militarism is not the only enticement with which fascism captures the youth. It

feeds and clothes some of them in its detachment, gives work to others, even sets up so-called cultural institutions for the youth, trying in this way to imbue them with the idea that it really can and wants to feed, clothe, teach and provide work for the masses of the boiling youth.

In a number of capitalist countries, our *Young Communist Leagues* are still largely sectarian organizations divorced from the masses. Their fundamental weakness is that they are still trying to copy the Communist Parties, their forms and methods of work, forgetting that the Y.C.L. is *not a Communist Party of the youth*. They do not sufficiently take into consideration the fact that this is an organization having its own specific tasks. Its methods and forms of work, of education and of struggle, must be adapted to the specific level and needs of the youth.

Our Young Communists have given memorable examples of heroism in the fight against fascist violence and bourgeois reaction. But they still lack the ability to win the masses of the youth away from hostile influences by dint of stubborn, concrete work. This is attested by the fact that they have not yet overcome their opposition to work in the fascist mass organizations, and that their approach to the Socialist youth and other non-Communist youth is not always correct.

A great part of the responsibility for all this must be borne, of course, by the Communist Parties as well, for they ought to lead and support the Y.C.L. in its work. For the problem of the youth is not only a Y.C.L. problem. *It is a problem for the entire Communist movement*. In the struggle for the youth, the Communist Parties and the Y.C.L. organizations must actually effect a decisive change. The main task of the Communist youth movement in capitalist countries is to advance boldly in the direction of bringing about the *united front*, along the path of organizing and uniting the toilers of the young generation. The tremendous importance for the revolutionary movement of the youth that attaches to even the first steps taken in this direction is shown by the examples of *France* and the *United States* during the recent past. It was sufficient in these countries to proceed to apply the united front, when considerable successes were at once achieved. In the sphere of the international united front, the successful initiative of the anti-fascist and anti-war committee in Paris in bringing about the international co-operation of all non-

fascist youth organizations is also worthy of note in this connection.

These recent successful steps in the united front movement of the youth also show that the forms which the united front of the youth is to assume must not be stereotyped, nor be necessarily the same as those met with in the practice of the Communist Parties. The Young Communist Leagues must strive in every way to unite the forces of all non-fascist mass organizations of the youth, including the formation of various kinds of common organizations for the struggle against fascism, against the unprecedented manner in which the youth is being stripped of every right, against the militarization of the youth and for the economic and cultural rights of the young generation, in order to draw these young toilers over to the side of the anti-fascist front, no matter where they may be—in the factories, the forced labour camps, the labour exchanges, the army barracks and the fleet, the schools, or in the various sports, cultural or other organizations.

In developing and strengthening the Y.C.L., our Y.C.L. members must work for the formation of anti-fascist associations of the Communist and Socialist Youth Leagues on a platform of class struggle.

WOMEN AND THE UNITED FRONT

Nor was work among toiling women—among working women, unemployed women, peasant women and housewives—underestimated any less than was work among the youth. While fascism exacts most from youth, it enslaves women with particular ruthlessness and cynicism, playing on the most painful feelings of the mothers, the housewife, the single working woman, uncertain of the morrow. Fascism, posing as a benefactor, throws the starving family a few beggarly scraps, trying in this way to stifle the bitterness aroused particularly among the toiling women, by the unprecedented slavery which fascism brings them. It drives working women out of industry, forcibly ships needy girls to the country, reducing them to the position of unpaid servants of rich farmers and landlords. While promising women a happy home and family life, it drives women to prostitution like no other capitalist regime.

Communists, above all our women Communists, must remember that there cannot be a successful fight against fascism and war unless the broad masses of women are drawn into it.

And agitation alone will not accomplish this. We must find a way of mobilizing the masses of toiling women around their vital interests and demands, taking into account the concrete situation in each instance, in the fight for their demands against high prices, for higher wages on the basis of the principle of equal pay for equal work, against mass dismissals, against every manifestation of inequality in the status of women, and against fascist enslavement.

In endeavouring to draw the toiling women into the revolutionary movement, we must not be afraid of forming separate women's organizations for this purpose, wherever necessary. The preconceived notion that the women's organizations under Communist Party leadership in the capitalist countries must be liquidated, as part of the struggle against "women's separatism" in the labour movement, has frequently caused a great deal of harm.

It is necessary to seek out the simplest and most flexible forms, in order to establish contact and bring about co-operation in struggle between the revolutionary, Social-Democratic and progressive anti-war and anti-fascist women's organizations. We must spare no pains to see that the women workers and toilers fight shoulder to shoulder with their class brothers in the ranks of the united working class front and the anti-fascist people's front.

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITED FRONT

In connection with the changed international and internal situation, exceptional importance attaches in all colonial and semi-colonial countries to the question of the *anti-imperialist united front*.

In forming a wide anti-imperialist united front of struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies, it is necessary above all to recognize the variety of conditions in which the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses is proceeding, the varying degree of maturity of the national liberation movement, the role of the proletariat within it and the influence of the Communist Party over the broad masses.

In Brazil the problem differs from that in India, China, etc.

In Brazil the Communist Party, having laid a correct foundation for the development of the united anti-imperialist front by the establishment of the National Liberation Alliance, has to make every effort to extend further this front by drawing

into it first and foremost the many millions of the peasantry, leading up to the formation of units of a people's revolutionary army, completely devoted to the revolution, and to the establishment of the rule of the National Liberation Alliance.

In *India* the Communists have to support, extend and participate in all anti-imperialist mass activities, not excluding those which are under national reformist leadership. While maintaining their political and organizational independence, they must carry on active work inside the organizations which take part in the Indian National Congress, facilitating the process of crystallization of a national revolutionary wing among them, for the purpose of further developing the national liberation movement of the Indian peoples against British imperialism.

In *China*, where the people's movement has already led to the formation of Soviet districts over a considerable territory of the country and to the organization of a powerful Red army, the predatory attack of Japanese imperialism and the treason of the Nanking Government have brought into jeopardy the national existence of the great Chinese people. Only the Chinese Soviets can act as a unifying center in the struggle against the enslavement and partition of China by the imperialists, as a unifying center which will rally all anti-imperialist forces for the national defense of the Chinese people.

We therefore approve the initiative taken by our courageous brother Party of China in the creation of a most extensive anti-imperialist united front against Japanese imperialism and its Chinese agents, jointly with all those organized forces existing on the territory of China which are ready to wage a real struggle for the salvation of their country and their people. I am sure that I express the sentiments and thoughts of our entire Congress if I state that we send our warmest fraternal greetings, in the name of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world, to all the Soviets of China, to the Chinese revolutionary people. (*Loud applause, all rise.*) We send our ardent fraternal greetings to the heroic Red Army of China, tried in a thousand battles. (*Loud applause.*) And we assure the Chinese people of our firm resolve to support its struggle for its complete liberation from all imperialist robbers and their Chinese henchmen. (*Loud applause, all rise. The ovation lasts several minutes. Cheers from all delegates.*)

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED FRONT

Comrades, we have taken a bold and determined course towards the united front of the working class, and are ready to carry it out with full consistency.

If we Communists are asked whether we advocate the united front *only* in the struggle for partial demands, or whether we are prepared to share the responsibility even when it will be a question of forming a *government* on the basis of the united front, then we say with a full sense of our responsibility: Yes, we recognize that a situation may arise in which the formation of a *government of the proletarian united front*, or of the *anti-fascist people's front*, will become not only possible but necessary in the interests of the proletariat. (*Applause.*) And in that case we shall declare for the formation of such a government without the slightest hesitation.

I am not speaking of a government which may be formed *after* the victory of the proletarian revolution. It is not impossible, of course, that in some country, immediately after the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, there may be formed a Soviet government on the basis of a government bloc of the Communist Party with a definite party (or its Left wing) participating in the revolution. After the October Revolution the victorious Party of the Russian Bolsheviks, as we know, included representatives of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries in the Soviet government. This was a specific feature of the first Soviet government after the victory of the October Revolution.

I am not speaking of such a case, but of the possible formation of a united front government on the eve of and before the victory of the Soviet revolution.

What kind of government is this? And in what situation could there be any question of such a government?

It is primarily a *government of struggle against fascism and reaction*. It must be a government arising as the result of the united front movement and in no way restricting the activity of the Communist Party and the mass organizations of the working class, but on the contrary, taking determined measures against the counter-revolutionary financial magnates and their fascist agents.

At a suitable moment, relying on the growing united front movement, the Communist Party of a given country

will declare for the formation of such a government on the basis of a definite anti-fascist platform.

Under what objective conditions will it be possible to form such a government? In the most general terms, our reply to this question will be as follows: Under conditions of *political crisis*, when the ruling classes are no longer in a condition to cope with the mighty upsurge of the mass anti-fascist movement. But this is only a general perspective, without which it is scarcely possible in practice to form a united front government. Only the existence of definite and *specific pre-requisites* can put on the order of the day the question of forming such a government as a politically *necessary* task. It seems to me that the following prerequisites deserve the greatest attention in this connection.

First, the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie must already be sufficiently *disorganized* and *paralyzed*, so that the bourgeoisie cannot prevent the formation of a government of struggle against reaction and fascism;

Second, the broadest masses of toilers, particularly the mass trade unions, must be in a violent state of revolt *against fascism and reaction, though not ready to rise in insurrection, to fight under Communist Party leadership for the achievement of Soviet Power*;

Third, the differentiation and Leftward movement in the ranks of Social-Democracy and other parties participating in the united front must already have reached the point where a considerable proportion of them demand *ruthless measures against the fascists and the other reactionaries*, struggle together with the Communists against fascism, and openly come out against that reactionary section of their own party which is hostile to Communism.

When and in what countries a situation will actually arise in which these prerequisites will be present in a sufficient degree, it is impossible to state in advance. 'But inasmuch as such a possibility is *not precluded in any of the capitalist countries* we must reckon with it, and not only orientate and prepare ourselves but orientate also the working class accordingly.

The fact that we are bringing up this question for discussion at all today is, of course, connected with our evaluation of the situation and the immediate prospects, also with the actual growth of the united front movement in a number of countries during the recent past. For more than ten years the

*situation in the capitalist countries has been such that it was not necessary for the Communist International to discuss a question of this kind.

You remember, comrades, that at our Fourth Congress, in 1922, and again at the Fifth Congress, in 1924, the question of the slogan of a *workers'*, or a *workers' and peasants' government*, was under discussion. Originally the issue turned essentially upon a question which was almost analogous to the one we are discussing today. The debates that took place at that time in the Communist International concerning this question, and in particular the political errors which were committed in connection with it, have to this day retained their importance for *sharpening our vigilance against the danger of deviations to the Right or "Left" from the Bolshevik line on this question*. Therefore I shall briefly point out a few of these errors, in order to draw from them the lessons necessary for the present policy of our Parties.

The *first* series of mistakes was determined precisely by the circumstance that the question of a workers' government was not clearly and firmly interlinked with the existence of a political crisis. Owing to this the *Right opportunists* were able to interpret matters as though we should strive for the formation of a workers' government, supported by the Communist Party, in any, so to speak, "normal" situation. The *ultra-Lefts*, on the other hand, recognized only such a workers' government as could be formed exclusively by armed insurrection, *after* the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Both views were wrong. In order to avoid a repetition of such mistakes, we now lay *such great stress on the exact consideration* of the specific, concrete circumstances of the political crisis and the upsurge of the mass movement, in which the formation of a united front government may prove possible and politically necessary.

The *second* series of errors was determined by the circumstances that the question of a workers' government was not interlinked with the development of the militant mass *united front movement of the proletariat*. Thus the *Right opportunists* were enabled to distort the question, reducing it to the unprincipled tactics of forming blocs with Social-Democratic Parties on the basis of purely parliamentary arrangements. The *ultra-Lefts*, on the other hand, shouted: "No coalitions with the counter-revolutionary Social-Democrats!" regarding all Social-Democrats as counter-revolutionaries at bottom.

Both were wrong, and we now emphasize, on the one hand, that we are not in the least anxious for such a "workers' government" as would be nothing more or less than an enlarged Social-Democratic government. We even prefer to waive calling it a "workers' government," and *speak of a united front government* which in political character is something absolutely different, *different in principle*, from all the Social-Democratic governments which usually call themselves "workers' (or Labour) governments." While the Social-Democratic government is an instrument of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie in the interest of the preservation of the capitalist order, a *united front government* is an instrument of collaboration between the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat and other anti-fascist parties, in the interest of the entire toiling population, a government of struggle against fascism and reaction. Obviously there is a radical *difference* between these two things.

On the other hand, we emphasize the necessity of seeing *the difference between the two different camps of Social-Democracy*. As I have already pointed out, there is a reactionary camp of Social-Democracy, but alongside of it there exists and is growing the camp of the Left Social-Democrats (without quotation marks), of workers who are becoming revolutionary. The decisive difference between them in practice consists in their attitude to the united front of the working class. The reactionary Social-Democrats are *against* the united front; they slander the united front movement, they sabotage and disintegrate it, as it undermines their policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie. The Left Social-Democrats are *for the united front*; they defend, develop and strengthen the united front movement. Inasmuch as this united front movement is a militant movement against fascism and reaction, it will be a constant motive force, impelling the united front government to struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie. The more powerfully this mass movement develops, the greater the force which it can offer to the government to combat the reactionaries. And the better this mass movement will be organized *from below*, the wider the network of *non-partisan class organs of the united front in the factories, among the unemployed, among the workers' districts, among the small people of town and country*, the greater will be the guarantee against a possible degeneration of the policy of the united front government.

• The *third* series of mistaken views which came to light during our former debates touched precisely on the *practical policy* of the "workers' government." The *Right opportunists* considered that a "workers' government" ought to keep "within the framework of bourgeois democracy," and consequently ought not to take any steps going beyond this framework. The *ultra-Lefts*, on the other hand, actually refused to make any attempt to form a united front government.

In 1923 *Saxony* and *Thuringia* presented a clear picture of a *Right opportunist* "workers' government" in action. The entry of the Communists into the Saxony government jointly with the Left Social-Democrats (Zeigner group) was no mistake in itself; on the contrary, the revolutionary situation in Germany fully justified this step. But, when participating in the government, the Communists should have used their positions primarily for the purpose of *arming the proletariat*. This they did not do. They did not even requisition a single apartment of the rich, although the housing shortage among the workers was so great that many of them were still without a roof over their heads, together with their wives and children. They also did *nothing* to organize the revolutionary mass movement of the workers. They behaved generally like ordinary parliamentary ministers "within the framework of bourgeois democracy." As you know this was the result of the opportunist policy of Brandler and his adherents. The result was such bankruptcy that we are still compelled to refer to the government of Saxony as the classical example of how revolutionaries should *not* behave when in office.

Comrades, we demand of every united front government an entirely different policy. We demand that such a government carry out definite and *fundamental revolutionary demands* required by the situation. For instance, control of production, control of the banks, disbanding of the police, its replacement by an armed workers' militia, etc.

Fifteen years ago Lenin called upon us to focus all our attention on "searching out forms of *transition* or *approach* to the proletarian revolution." It may be that in a number of countries the *united front government* will prove to be one of the most important transitional forms. The "Left" doctrinaires always evaded this precept of Lenin's. Like the limited propagandists that they were, they spoke only of "aims," without ever worrying about "forms of transition." The *Right opportunists*, on the other hand, tried to establish

a special "*democratic intermediate stage*" lying between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the purpose of instilling into the workers the illusion of a peaceful parliamentary procession from the one dictatorship to the other. This fictitious "*intermediate stage*" they also called the "*transitional form*," and even quoted Lenin on the subject! But this piece of swindling was not difficult to expose; for Lenin spoke of the form of transition and approach to the "*proletarian revolution*," i.e., to the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship, and *not* of some transitional form *between* the bourgeois and the proletarian dictatorship.

Why did Lenin attribute such exceptionally great importance to the form of transition to the proletarian revolution? Because he bore in mind "*the fundamental law of all great revolutions*," the law that for the masses propaganda and agitation alone cannot take the place of *their own political experience*, when it is a question of attracting really broad masses of the toilers to the side of the revolutionary vanguard, without which a victorious struggle for power is impossible. It is a common mistake of a Leftist character to imagine that as soon as a political (or revolutionary) crisis arises, it is enough for the Communist leaders to throw out the slogan of revolutionary insurrection, and the broad masses will follow them. No, even in such a crisis the masses are far from always being ready to do so. We saw this in the case of *Spain*. To help the *millions* to master as rapidly as possible, through their own experience, what they have to do, where to find a radical solution, what party is worthy of their confidence—these among others are the purposes for which both transitional slogans and special "*forms of transition or approach to the proletarian revolution*" are necessary. Otherwise the great mass of the people, a prey to petty-bourgeois democratic illusions and traditions, may waver even when there is a revolutionary situation, may procrastinate and stray, without finding the road to revolution and then come under the axe of the fascist executioners.

That is why we indicate the possibility of forming a government of the anti-fascist united front in the conditions of a political crisis. In so far as such a government will really prosecute the struggle against the enemies of the people, and give a free hand to the working class and the Communist Party, we Communists shall accord it our unstinted support, and as

soldiers of the revolution shall take our place in the *first line of fire*. But we state frankly to the masses :

Final salvation this government cannot bring. It is not in a position to overthrow the class rule of the exploiters, and for this reason cannot finally eliminate the danger of fascist counter-revolution. Consequently it is necessary to *prepare for the socialist revolution!* Soviet power and *only* Soviet power can bring such salvation!

In estimating the present development of the world situation, we see that a *political crisis* is maturing in quite a number of countries. This determines the great urgency and importance of a firm decision by our Congress on the question of a united front government.

If our Parties are able to utilize in a Bolshevik fashion the opportunity of forming a united front government, of waging the struggle for its formation and the existence in power of such a government *for the revolutionary training of the masses*, this will be the best political justification of our policy of the formation of united front governments.

THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

One of the weakest aspects of the anti-fascist struggle of our Parties lies in the fact that they *react inadequately and too slowly to the demagoguery of fascism*, and to this day continue to look with disdain upon the problems of the struggle against fascist ideology. Many comrades did not believe that so reactionary a variety of bourgeois ideology as the ideology of fascism, which in its stupidity frequently reaches the point of lunacy, was capable of gaining a mass influence at all. This was a great mistake. The putrefaction of capitalism penetrates to the innermost core of its ideology and culture, while the desperate situation of the broad masses of the people renders certain sections of them susceptible to infection from the ideological refuse of this putrefaction.

We must under no circumstances underrate this fascist capacity for ideological infection. On the contrary, we must develop for our part an extensive ideological struggle on the basis of clear, popular argumentation and a correct, well thought-out approach to the peculiarities of the national psychology of the masses of the people.

The fascists are rummaging through the entire history of every nation so as to be able to pose as the heirs and con-

tinuators of all that was exalted and heroic in its past, while all that was degrading or offensive to the national sentiments of the people they make use of as weapons against the enemies of fascism. Hundreds of books are being published in Germany which pursue only one aim—to falsify the history of the German people and give it a fascist complexion.

The new-baked National-Socialist historians try to depict the history of Germany as if for the last two thousand years, by virtue of some "historical law," a certain line of development had run through it like a red thread which led to the appearance on the historical scene of a national "saviour," a "Messiah," of the German people, a certain "corporal" of Austrian extraction! In these books the greatest figures of the German people in the past are represented as having been fascists, while the great peasant movements are set down as the direct precursors of the fascist movement.

Mussolini makes every effort to capitalize the heroic figure of Garibaldi. The French fascists bring to the fore as their heroine Joan of Arc. The American fascists appeal to the traditions of the American War of Independence, the traditions of Washington and Lincoln. The Bulgarian fascists make use of the national liberation movement of the 'seventies and its heroes beloved of the people, Vassil Levsky, Stephen Karaj, and others.

Communists who suppose that all this has nothing to do with the cause of the working class, who do nothing to enlighten the masses on the past of their own people, in a historically correct fashion, in a genuinely Marxist, a Leninist-Marxist, a Lenin-Stalin spirit, who do nothing to link up their present struggle with its revolutionary traditions and past—voluntarily relinquish to fascist falsifiers all that is valuable in the historical past of the nation, that the fascists may bamboozle the masses. (Applause.)

No, comrades, we are concerned with every important question, not only of the present and the future, but also of the past of our own peoples. For we Communists do not pursue a narrow policy based on the craft interests of the workers. We are not of those narrow-minded functionaries of the trade unions or leaders of the medieval guild handicraftsmen and journeymen. We are the representatives of the class interests of the most important, the greatest class of modern society—the working class, to whose destiny it falls to free mankind from the sufferings of the capitalist system, the class

which on one-sixth of the world has already cast off the yoke of capitalism and constitutes the ruling class. We defend the vital interests of all the exploited toiling strata, i.e., of the overwhelming majority in any capitalist country.

We Communists are the *irreconcilable opponents, on principle*, of bourgeois nationalism of every variety. But we are *not supporters of national nihilism*, and should never act as such. The task of educating the workers and all toilers in the spirit of proletarian internationalism is one of the fundamental tasks of every Communist Party. But whoever thinks that this permits him, or even compels him, to sneer at all the national sentiments of the broad toiling masses is far from genuine Bolshevism, and has understood nothing of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the national question. (*Applause.*)

Lenin, who always fought bourgeois nationalism resolutely and consistently, gave us an example of the correct approach to the problem of national sentiments, in his article "On the National Pride of the Great-Russians," written in 1914. I shall quote a passage :

"Are we enlightened Great-Russian proletarians impervious to the feeling of national pride? Certainly not. We love our language and our motherland; we, more than any other group, are working to raise its labouring masses (i.e., nine-tenths of its population) to the level of intelligent democrats and Socialists. We, more than anybody, are grieved to see and feel to what violence, oppression and mockery our beautiful motherland is being subjected by the tsarist hangmen, the nobles and the capitalists. We are proud of the fact that those acts of violence met with resistance in our midst, in the midst of the Great-Russians; that we have given the world Radishchev, the Decembrist, the declassé revolutionaries of the 'seventies; that in 1905 the Great-Russian working class created a powerful revolutionary party of the masses.... We are filled with national pride because of the knowledge that the Great-Russian nation, too, has created a revolutionary class; that it, too, has proven capable of giving humanity great examples of struggle for freedom and for Socialism; that its contribution is not confined solely to great pogroms, numerous scaffolds, torture chambers, great famines, and great servility before the priests, the tsars, the landowners and the capitalists.

"We are filled with national pride, and therefore we *particularly hate our slavish past....* and our slavish present, in which the same landowners, aided by the capitalists, lead us into war to stifle Poland and the Ukraine, to throttle the democratic movement in Persia and in China,

to strengthen the gang of Romanovs, Bobrinskys, Purishkeviches that cover with shame our Great-Russian national dignity.”*

This is what Lenin wrote on national pride.

I think, comrades, that when the fascists, at the Leipzig trial, attempted to slander the Bulgarians as a barbarian people, I was not wrong in taking up the defense of the national honour of the toiling masses of the Bulgarian people, who are struggling heroically against the fascist usurpers, the real barbarians and savages (*strong and continued applause*), nor was I wrong in declaring that I had no cause to be ashamed of being a Bulgarian but that, on the contrary, I was proud of being a son of the heroic Bulgarian working class. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, proletarian internationalism must, so to speak, “acclimatize itself” in each country in order to sink deep roots in its native land. *National forms* of the proletarian class struggle and of the labour movement in the individual countries are in no contradiction to proletarian internationalism; on the contrary, it is precisely in these forms that the *international interests* of the proletariat can be successfully defended.

It goes without saying that it is necessary *everywhere and on all occasions* to expose before the masses and prove to them concretely that on the pretext of defending general national interests, the fascist bourgeoisie is conducting its egotistical policy of oppressing and exploiting its own people, as well as robbing and enslaving other nations. But we must not *confine ourselves* to this. We must at the same time prove by the very struggle of the working class and the actions of the Communist Parties that the proletariat in rising against every manner of bondage and national oppression is the *only* true fighter for national freedom and the independence of the people.

The interests of the class struggle of the proletariat against its native exploiters and oppressors are in no contradiction whatever to the interests of a free and happy future of the nation. On the contrary, the Socialist revolution will signify the *saving of the nation* and will open up to it the road to loftier heights. By the *very fact* of building at the present

*Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 100-101.

time its class organizations and consolidating its positions, by the very fact of defending the democratic rights and liberties against fascism, by the very fact of fighting for the overthrow of capitalism, the working class is fighting for the future of the nation.

The revolutionary proletariat is fighting to save the culture of the people, to liberate it from the shackles of decaying monopoly capitalism, from barbarous fascism which is violating it. *Only* the proletarian revolution can avert the destruction of culture, and raise it to the highest stage of florescence as a truly national culture—*national in form and socialist in content*—which, under *Stalin's* leadership, is being realized in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics before our very eyes. (Applause.)

Proletarian internationalism not only does not contradict this struggle of the toilers of the individual countries for national, social and cultural freedom but, thanks to international proletarian solidarity and fighting unity, provides the support which is necessary for victory in this struggle. The working class in the capitalist countries can triumph *only in closest alliance* with the victorious proletariat of the great Soviet Union. *Only* by struggling hand in hand with the proletariat of the imperialist countries can the colonial peoples and oppressed national minorities achieve their freedom. The road to victory for the proletarian revolution in the imperialist countries lies *only* through the revolutionary alliance of the working class of the imperialist countries with the national liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, because, as *Marx* taught us, "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations."

Communists belonging to an oppressed, dependent nation cannot combat chauvinism successfully among the people of their own nation if they *do not at the same time show* in practice, in the mass movement, that they actually struggle for the liberation of their nation from the alien yoke. And again, on the other hand, the Communists of an oppressing nation cannot do what is necessary to educate the toiling masses of their nation in the spirit of internationalism *without waging* a resolute struggle against the oppressor policy of their "own" bourgeoisie for the right to complete self-determination of the nations kept in bondage by it. If they do not do this, they likewise do not make it easier for the toilers of the oppressed nation to overcome their nationalist prejudices.

If we act in this spirit, if in all our mass work we prove convincingly that we are free of both national nihilism and bourgeois nationalism, then and only then shall we be able to wage a really successful struggle against the chauvinist demagoguery of the fascists.

This is the reason why a correct and practical application of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy is of such paramount importance. It is *unquestionably an essential* preliminary condition for a successful struggle against chauvinism—this main instrument of ideological influence of the fascists upon the masses. (Applause.)

III. CONSOLIDATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES AND STRUGGLE FOR THE POLITICAL UNITY OF THE PROLETARIAT

COMRADES, in the struggle for the establishment of the united front the importance of the leading role of the Communist Party increases extraordinarily. Only the Communist Party is at bottom the initiator, the organizer and the driving force of the united front of the working class.

The Communist Parties can ensure the mobilization of the broadest masses of the toilers for a united struggle against fascism and the offensive of capital *only if they strengthen their own ranks in every respect*, if they develop their initiative, pursue a Marxist-Leninist policy and apply correct, flexible tactics which take into account the concrete situation and alignment of class forces.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

In the period between the Sixth and Seventh Congresses, our Parties in the capitalist countries have undoubtedly *grown in stature and have been considerably steeled*. But it would be a most dangerous mistake to rest on this achievement. The more the united front of the working class extends, the more will new, complex problems rise before us and the more will it be necessary for us to work on the political and organizational consolidation of our Parties. The united front of the proletariat brings to the fore an army of workers which will be able to carry out its mission if this army is headed by a leading force which will point out its aims and paths. This leading force can *only be a strong proletarian, revolutionary party*.

If we Communists exert every effort to establish a united front, we do this not for the narrow purpose of recruiting new members for the Communist Parties. But we must strengthen the Communist Parties in every way and increase their membership *for the very reason that we seriously want to strengthen the united front*. The strengthening of the

Communist Parties is not a narrow Party concern but the concern of the entire working class.

The unity, revolutionary cohesion and fighting preparedness of the Communist Parties constitute most valuable capital which belongs not only to us but to the entire working class. We have combined and shall continue to combine our readiness to march jointly with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations to the struggle against fascism with an irreconcilable struggle against Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of compromise with the bourgeoisie, and consequently also against *any penetration* of this ideology into our own ranks.

In boldly and resolutely carrying out the policy of the united front, we meet in our own ranks with obstacles which we must remove at all costs in the shortest possible time.

After the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, a *successful struggle was waged* in all Communist Parties of the capitalist countries *against any tendency towards an opportunist adaptation to the conditions of capitalist stabilization and against any infection with reformist and legalist illusions*. Our Parties purged their ranks of various kinds of Right opportunists, thus strengthening their Bolshevik unity and fighting capacity. Less successful and frequently entirely lacking was the fight against *sectarianism*. Sectarianism manifested itself no longer in primitive, open forms, as in the first years of the existence of the Communist International, but, under cover of a formal recognition of the Bolshevik theses, hindered the development of a Bolshevik mass policy. In our day this is often no longer an *"infantile disorder,"* as Lenin wrote, but a *deeply rooted vice*, which must be shaken off or it will be impossible to solve the problem of establishing the united front of the proletariat and of leading the masses from the positions of reformism to the side of revolution.

In the present situation sectarianism, *self-satisfied sectarianism*, as we designate it in the draft resolution, *more than anything else* impedes our struggle for the realization of the united front. Sectarianism, satisfied with its *doctrinaire narrowness*, its divorce from the real life of the masses; satisfied with its *simplified methods* of solving the most complex problems of the working class movement on the basis of stereotyped schemes; sectarianism, which professes to know all and considers it needless to learn from the masses, from the lessons of the labour movement. In short, sectarianism, to which, as they say, mountains are mere stepping-stones.

Self-satisfied sectarianism *will not and cannot* understand that the leadership of the working class by the Communist Party cannot be attained by a process of spontaneous development. The leading role of the Communist Party in the struggles of the working class must be won. For this purpose it is necessary, not to rant about the leading role of the Communists, but to *merit and win the confidence of the working masses* by everyday mass work and correct policy. This will only be possible if we Communists in our political work seriously take into account the actual level of the class consciousness of the masses, the degree to which they have become revolutionized, if we soberly appraise the concrete situation, not on the basis of our wishes but on the basis of the actual state of affairs. Patiently, step by step, we must make it easier for the broad masses to come over to the positions of Communism. We ought never to forget these warning words of Lenin, so forcefully expressed :

"...this is the whole point—we must *not* regard that which is obsolete *for us* as obsolete *for the class*, as obsolete *for the masses*."*

Is it not a fact, comrades, that there are still not a few such doctrinaire elements left in our ranks who at all times and places sense nothing but danger in the policy of the united front? For such comrades the whole united front is one unrelieved peril. But this sectarian "stickling for principle" is nothing but political helplessness in face of the difficulties of directly leading the struggle of the masses.

Sectarianism finds expression *particularly* in overestimating the revolutionization of the masses, in overestimating the speed at which they are abandoning the positions of reformism, in attempts to leap over difficult stages and over complicated tasks of the movement. Methods of leading the masses have in practice been frequently replaced by the methods of leading a narrow party group. The power of traditional contacts between the masses and their organizations and leaders has been underestimated, and when the masses did not break off these contacts immediately, the attitude taken towards them was just as harsh as that adopted towards their reactionary leaders.

*Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism : An Infantile Disorder, Little Lenin Library, p. 41.

Tactics and slogans have tended to become stereotyped for all countries, and the special features of the specific conditions in each individual country have been left out of account. The necessity of stubborn struggle in the very midst of the masses themselves to win their confidence has tended to be ignored, the struggle for the partial demands of the workers and work in the reformist trade unions and fascist mass organizations has been neglected. The policy of the united front has frequently been replaced by bare appeals and abstract propaganda.

In no less a degree have sectarian views hindered the correct selection of people, the training and developing of *cadres connected with the masses, enjoying the confidence of the masses, cadres whose revolutionary mettle has been tried and tested in class battles, cadres that are capable of combining the practical experience of mass work with the staunchness of principle of a Bolshevik.*

Thus sectarianism has to a considerable extent retarded the growth of the Communist Parties, has impeded the prosecution of a real mass policy, prevented our taking advantage of the difficulties of the class enemy to strengthen the positions of the revolutionary movement, hindered the winning over of the broad proletarian masses to the side of the Communist Parties.

While fighting most resolutely to overcome and exterminate the last remnants of self-satisfied sectarianism, we must increase to a maximum our vigilance in regard to and the struggle against *Right opportunism* and against every one of its concrete manifestations, bearing in mind that the danger of Right opportunism will increase in proportion as the wide united front develops more and more. Already there are tendencies to reduce the role of the Communist Party in the ranks of the united front and to effect a reconciliation with Social-Democratic ideology. Nor must the fact be lost sight of that the tactics of the united front are 'a method of convincing the Social-Democratic workers by object lesson of the correctness of the Communist policy and the incorrectness of the reformist policy, and that they are not a reconciliation with Social-Democratic ideology and practice. A successful struggle for the establishment of the united front imperatively demands constant struggle in our ranks against tendencies to depreciate the role of the Party, against legalist illusions, against reliance on spontaneity and automatism, both in liquid-

ating fascism and in conducting the united front against the *slightest vacillation at the moment of determined action.*

"It is necessary," Stalin teaches us, "that the Party be able to combine in its work the greatest adhesion to principle (not to be confused with sectarianism!) with a maximum of contacts and connections with the mass (not to be confused with 'tailism!'), without which it is not only impossible for the Party to teach the masses but also to learn from them, not only to lead the masses and raise them to the level of the Party, but to listen to the voice of the masses and divine their sorest needs." (Stalin "The Perspective of the Communist Party of Germany and Bolshevikization," *Pravda*, No. 27, February 3, 1925.)

POLITICAL UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

Comrades, the development of the united front of joint struggle of the Communist and Social-Democratic workers against fascism and the offensive of capital likewise brings to the fore the question of *political unity, of a single political mass party of the working class.* The Social-Democratic workers are becoming more and more convinced by experience that the struggle against the class enemy demands unity of political leadership, inasmuch as *duality in leadership* impedes the further development and reinforcement of the joint struggle of the working class.

The interests of the class struggle of the proletariat and the success of the proletarian revolution make it imperative that there be a *single party of the proletariat* in each country. Of course, it is not so easy or simple to achieve this. This requires stubborn work and struggle and will of necessity be a more or less protracted process. The Communist Parties must, in reliance upon the growing urge of the workers for a unification of the Social-Democratic Parties or of individual organizations with the Communist Parties, firmly and confidently take the initiative in this unification. The cause of amalgamating the forces of the working class in a single revolutionary proletarian party, at the time when the international labour movement is entering the period of closing the split in its ranks, is *our cause*, is the cause of the Communist International.

But while it is sufficient for the establishment of the united front of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties to have an agreement to struggle against fascism, the offensive of

capital and war, the achievement of political unity is possible only on the basis of a number of definite conditions involving principles.

This unification is possible only : 6

First, on condition of their complete independence of the bourgeoisie and the complete rupture of the bloc of Social-Democracy with the bourgeoisie ;

Second, on condition that unity of action be first brought about ;

Third, on condition that the necessity of the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets be recognized ;

Fourth, on condition that support of one's own bourgeoisie in imperialist war be rejected ;

Fifth, on condition that the Party be constructed on the basis of democratic centralism, which ensures unity of will and action, and has been tested by the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks.

We must explain to the Social-Democratic workers, patiently and in comradely fashion, why political unity of the working class is impossible without these conditions. We must discuss together with them the sense and significance of these conditions.

Why is it necessary for the realization of the political unity of the proletariat that there be complete independence of the bourgeoisie and a rupture of the bloc of Social-Democrats with the bourgeoisie ?

Because the entire experience of the labour movement, particularly the experience of the fifteen years of coalition policy in Germany, has shown that the policy of class collaboration, the policy of dependence on the bourgeoisie, leads to the defeat of the working class and to the victory of fascism. And only the road of irreconcilable class struggle against the bourgeoisie, the road of the Bolsheviks, is the true road to victory.

Why must unity of action be first established as a preliminary condition of political unity ?

Because unity of action to repel the offensive of capital and of fascism is possible and necessary even before the majority of the workers are united on a common political platform for the overthrow of capitalism, while the working out of unity of views on the main lines and aims of the struggle of the

proletariat, without which a unification of the parties is impossible, requires a more or less extended period of time. And unity of views is worked out best of all in joint struggle against the class enemy *even today*. To propose to unite at once instead of forming a united front means to place the cart before the horse and to imagine that the cart will then move ahead. (*Laughter.*) Precisely for the reason that for us the question of political unity is not a manoeuvre, as it is for many Social-Democratic leaders, we insist on the realization of unity of action as one of the most important stages in the struggle for political unity.

Why is it necessary to recognize the necessity of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviet power?

Because the experience of the victory of the great October Revolution on the one hand, and, on the other, the bitter lessons learned in Germany, Austria and Spain during the entire post-war period have confirmed once more that the victory of the proletariat is possible only by means of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and that the bourgeoisie would rather drown the labour movement in a sea of blood than allow the proletariat to establish Socialism by peaceful means. The experience of the October Revolution has demonstrated patently that the basic content of the proletarian revolution is the question of the proletarian dictatorship, which is called to crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiters, to arm the revolution for the struggle against imperialism and to lead the revolution to the complete victory of Socialism. In order to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat as the dictatorship of the vast majority over an insignificant minority, over the exploiters—and only as such can it be brought about—for this are needed *Soviets* embracing all strata of the working class, the basic masses of the peasantry and the rest of the toilers without the awakening of whom, without the inclusion of whom in the front of the revolutionary struggle, the victory of the proletariat cannot be consolidated.

Why is the refusal of support to the bourgeoisie in an imperialist war a condition of political unity?

Because the bourgeoisie wages imperialist war for its predatory purposes, against the interests of the vast majority of the peoples, under whatever guise this war may be waged. Because all imperialists combine their feverish preparations for war with extremely intensified exploitation and oppression

of the toilers in their own country. Support of the bourgeoisie in such a war means treason to the country and the international working class.

Why, finally, is the building of the Party on the basis of democratic centralism a condition of unity?

Because only a party built on the basis of democratic centralism can ensure unity of will and action, can lead the proletariat to victory over the bourgeoisie, which has at its disposal so powerful a weapon as the centralized state apparatus. The application of the principle of democratic centralism has stood the splendid historical test of the experience of the Russian Bolshevik Party, the Party of Lenin and Stalin.

Yes, Comrades, we are for a single mass political party of the working class. But this party must be, in the words of Comrade Stalin,

“.... a militant party, a revolutionary party, bold enough to lead the proletarians to the struggle for power, with sufficient experience to be able to orientate itself in the complicated problems that arise in a revolutionary situation, and sufficiently flexible to steer clear of any submerged rocks on the way to its goal.”*

This explains why it is necessary to strive for political unity on the basis of the conditions indicated.

We are for the political unity of the working class! Therefore we are ready to collaborate most closely with all Social-Democrats who are for the united front and sincerely support unity on the principles indicated. But precisely because we are for unity, we shall struggle resolutely against all “Left” demagogues who will try to make use of the disillusionment of the Social-Democratic workers to create new Socialist Parties or Internationals directed against the Communist movement, and thus keep deepening the split in the working class.

We welcome the aspiration which is gaining ground among Social-Democratic workers for a united front with the Communists. In this fact we see a growth of their revolutionary consciousness and a beginning of the healing of the split in the working class. Being of the opinion that unity of action is a pressing necessity and the truest road to the establishment of the political unity of the proletariat as well, we declare that the Communist International and its Sections are ready to

* Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, p. 107.

enter into negotiations with the Second International and its Sections for the establishment of the unity of the working class in the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialist war. (*Applause.*)

CONCLUSION

COMRADES, I am concluding my report. As you see, we are raising a number of questions today in a new light, taking count of the change in the situation since the Sixth Congress and of the lessons of our struggle, and relying on the degree of consolidation in our ranks already achieved, primarily the question of the united front and of the approach to Social-Democracy, the reformist trade unions and other mass organizations.

There are wiseacres who will sense in all this a digression from our basic positions, some sort of turn to the Right of the straight line of Bolshevism. Well, in my country, Bulgaria, they say that a hungry chicken always dreams of millet. (*Laughter, loud applause.*)

Let those political chickens think so. (*Laughter, loud applause.*)

This interests us little. For us it is important that our own Parties and the broad masses of the whole world should correctly understand what we are striving for.

We would not be revolutionary Marxists, Leninists, worthy pupils of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, if we did not reconstruct our policies and tactics in accordance with the changing situation and the changes occurring in the labour movement.

We would not be real revolutionaries if we did not learn from our own experience and the experience of the masses.

We want our Parties in the capitalist countries to come out and act as *real political parties of the working class*, to become in actual fact a political factor in the life of their countries, to pursue at all times an *active Bolshevik mass policy* and not confine themselves to propaganda and criticism, and bare appeals to struggle for proletarian dictatorship.

We are enemies of all cut-and-dried schemes. We want to take into account the concrete situation at each moment, in each place, and not act according to a fixed, stereotyped form anywhere and everywhere; not to forget that in varying cir-

cumstances the position of the Communists cannot be *identical*.

We want soberly to take into account *all stages* in the development of the class struggle and in the growth of the class consciousness of the masses themselves, to be able to locate and solve at each stage the *concrete* problems of the revolutionary movement *corresponding* to this stage.

We want to find a *common language* with the broadest masses for the purpose of struggling against the class enemy, to find ways of finally overcoming *the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard* from the masses of the proletariat and all other toilers, as well as of overcoming the fatal isolation of the *working class itself* from its natural allies in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against fascism.

We want to draw increasingly wide masses into the revolutionary class struggle and lead them to proletarian revolution, *proceeding from their vital interests and needs as the starting point, and their own experience as the basis*.

Following the example of our glorious Russian Bolsheviks, the example of the leading Party of the Communist International, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we want to combine the *revolutionary heroism* of the German, the Spanish, the Austrian and other Communists *with genuine revolutionary realism*, and put an end to the last remnants of scholastic tinkering with serious political questions.

We want to equip our Parties from every angle for the solution of the most complex political problems confronting them. For this purpose we want to raise ever higher their *theoretical level*, to train them in the spirit of live Marxism-Leninism and not dead doctrinairism.

We want to eradicate from our ranks all *self-satisfied sectarianism*, which above all blocks our road to the masses and impedes the carrying out of a truly Bolshevik mass policy. We want to intensify in every way the struggle against all concrete manifestations of *Right opportunism*, realizing that the danger from this side will increase precisely in the practice of carrying out our mass policy and struggle.

We want the Communists of each country promptly to draw and apply *all the lessons* that can be drawn from their own experience as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. We want them *as quickly as possible to learn how to sail on the turbulent waters of the class struggle*, and not to remain on the shore as observers and registrars of the surging waves in the expectation of fine weather. (Applause.)

This is what we want!

And we want all this because only in this way will the working class at the head of all the toilers, welded into a million-strong revolutionary army, led by the Communist International and possessed of so great and wise a pilot as our leader Comrade Stalin (a storm of applause) be able to fulfil its historical mission with certainty—to sweep fascism off the face of the earth and, together with it, capitalism!

(The entire hall rises and gives Comrade Dimitroff a rousing ovation.

Cheers coming from the delegates are heard on all sides and in various languages: "Hurrah! Long live Comrade Dimitroff!"

The strains of the "Internationale" sung in every language fill the air. A new storm of applause sweeps the hall.

Voices: "Long live Comrade Stalin, long live Comrade Dimitroff!" "A Bolshevik cheer for Comrade Dimitroff, the standard-bearer of the Comintern!"

Someone shouts in Bulgarian: "Hurrah for Comrade Dimitroff, the valiant warrior of the Communist International against fascism!" The delegations sing in succession their revolutionary songs—the Italians "Bandiera Rossa," the Poles, "On the Barricades," the French, "Carmagnole," the Germans, "Roter Wedding," the Chinese, "March of the Chinese Red Army.")

FASCISM AND THE UNITY OF THE WORKING-CLASS

*(Speech in reply to discussion on report delivered on the
subject, vide p. 16.)*

COMRADES! The very full discussion on my report shows the immense interest taken by the Congress in the fundamental tactical problems and tasks of the struggle of the working class against the offensive of capital and fascism, against the threat of imperialist war.

Summing up the eight-day discussion we can state that all the principal propositions contained in the report have met with the unanimous approval of the Congress. None of the speakers objected to the tactical line we have proposed or to the resolution which has been submitted.

I venture to say that at none of the previous Congresses of the Communist International has such ideological and political solidarity been revealed as at the present Congress. *(Applause.)* The complete unanimity displayed at the Congress indicates that the necessity of revising our policy and tactics in accordance with the changed conditions and with due regard for the most abundant and instructive experience of the past few years, has come to be fully recognised in our ranks.

This unanimity may undoubtedly be regarded as one of the most important prerequisites for success in solving the paramount immediate problem of the international proletarian movement, namely, *establishing unity of action of all sections of the working class in the struggle against fascism.*

The successful solution of this problem requires, first, that Communists skilfully wield the weapon of *Marxist-Leninist analysis*, while carefully studying the specific conditions and the alignment of class forces as they develop, and plan their activity and struggle accordingly. We must mercilessly root out the weakness, not infrequently observed in our comrades, for cut-and-dried schemes, lifeless formulas and ready-made patterns. We must put an end to the state of affairs in which Communists, when lacking the knowledge or ability for Marxist-Leninist analysis, substitute general phrases and slogans such as "the revolutionary way out of the crisis,"

without making the slightest serious attempt to explain the conditions, the relationship of class forces, the degree of revolutionary maturity of the proletariat and the toiling masses, and the level of influence of the Communist Party necessary to render such a revolutionary way out of the crisis possible. Without such an analysis all these catch-words become "dud" shells, empty phrases which only obscure our tasks of the day. Without a concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis we shall be able correctly to present and solve the problem of fascism, the problem of the proletarian front and general people's front, the problem of our attitude towards bourgeois-democracy, the problem of the processes going on within the working class, particularly among the Social-Democratic workers, the problem of a united front government, or any of the numerous other new and complex problems with which life itself and the development of the class struggle confronts us now and will confront us in the future.

Second, we need *live people*—people who have grown up from the masses of the workers, have sprung from their everyday struggle, people of militant action wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of the proletariat, people whose brains and hands will give effect to the decisions of our Congress. Without Bolshevik, Leninist-Stalinist cadres we shall be unable to solve the enormous problems that confront the toilers in the fight against fascism.

Third, we need people equipped with the *compass of Marxist-Leninist theory*, for people who are unable to make skilful use of this instrument slip into narrow, make-shift politics, take decisions only from case to case, and lose the broad perspective of the struggle which shows the masses where we are going and whither we are leading the toilers.

Fourth, we need the *organisation of the masses* in order to put our decisions into practice. Our ideological and political influence alone is not enough. We must put a stop to reliance on *spontaneity in the movement* (on the hope that the movement would develop of its own accord), which is one of our fundamental weaknesses. We must remember that without persistent, prolonged, patient, and sometimes apparently thankless organisational work on our part, the masses will never make for the Communist shore. In order to be able to organise the masses we must acquire Lenin's and Stalin's art of making our decisions the property not only of the Communists but also of the broadest masses of

the toilers. We must learn to talk to the masses, not in the language of book formulas, but in the language of fighters in the cause of the masses, whose every word, whose every idea reflects the innermost thoughts and sentiments of millions.

It is with these problems that I should like to deal in my closing speech.

Comrades! The Congress has welcomed the new tactical lines with great enthusiasm and unanimity. Enthusiasm and unanimity are all very well, of course; but it is still better when these are combined with a well-considered and critical approach to the tasks that confront us, with a proper comprehension of the decisions adopted and a real understanding of the means and methods by which these decisions are to be applied to the particular circumstances of each country.

After all, we have before now unanimously adopted good resolutions, but the trouble was that not infrequently after adopting these decisions, we at best made them the property of only the small vanguard of the working class. These decisions did not become flesh and blood of the broad masses; they did not become a guide to the action of the millions.

Can we assert that we have already finally abandoned this formal approach to adopted decisions? No. It must be said that even at this Congress the speeches of some of the comrades gave indication of remnants of formalism; a desire made itself felt at times to substitute for the concrete analysis of reality and life's experience some sort of new scheme, some sort of new, over-simplified lifeless formula, to represent as *actually existing* what we *desire*, but does not yet exist.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM MUST BE CONCRETISED

No general characterisation of fascism, however correct in itself, can relieve us of the need to study and take into account the specific development of fascism and the various forms of fascist dictatorship in the individual countries and at its various stages. It is necessary in each country to investigate, study and ascertain the national peculiarities, the specific national features of fascism and map out accordingly effective methods and forms of struggle against fascism.

Lenin persistently warned us against "stereotyped methods and mechanical levelling against rendering tactical rules, rules of struggle, identical." This warning is particularly to the point when it is a question of fighting an enemy who so

subtly and Jesuitically exploits the national sentiments and prejudices of the masses and their anti-capitalist inclinations in the interests of big capital. *Such an enemy must be known to perfection, from every angle.* We must without any delay whatever react to his various manoeuvres, discover his hidden moves, be prepared to repel him in any arena and at any moment. We must not hesitate even to *learn* from the enemy if that will help us more quickly and more effectively to *wring his neck.* (Applause.)

It would be a gross mistake to lay down a universal rule of development of fascism, to cover all countries and all peoples. Such a rule would not help, but hamper us in carrying on a real struggle. Apart from everything else, such a rule would result in indiscriminately thrusting into the camp of fascism those sections of the population which, if properly approached, could, at a certain stage of development, be brought into the struggle against fascism, or could at least be neutralised.

Let us take, for example, the development of fascism in France and Germany. Some comrades believe that, generally speaking, fascism cannot develop as easily in France as in Germany. What is true and what is false in this contention? It is true that there were no such deep-seated democratic traditions in Germany as there are in France, which went through several revolutions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is true that France is a country which won the war and forced the Versailles system on other countries, that the national sentiments of the French people have not been hurt as they have been in Germany where this factor played such a great part. It is true that in France the basic masses of the peasantry are pro-Republic and anti-fascist, especially in the South, in contrast with Germany where even before fascism came to power a considerable section of the peasantry was under the influence of reactionary parties.

But, comrades, notwithstanding the existing differences in the development of the fascist movement in France and in Germany, notwithstanding the factors which impede the onslaught of fascism in France, it would be shortsightedness not to notice the uninterrupted growth there of the fascist peril and to under-estimate the possibility of a fascist *coup d'état*. Moreover, a number of factors in France favour the development of fascism. One must not forget that the economic crisis, which commenced later in France than in other capital-

ist countries, continues to deepen and sharpen, and this greatly facilitates the orgy of fascist demagoguery. French fascism holds strong positions in the army, among the officers, such as the National Socialists did not have in the Reichswehr before their advent to power. Furthermore, in no other country, perhaps, has the parliamentary regime been corrupted to such an enormous extent and caused such indignation among the masses as in France. Nor must it be forgotten that the development of fascism is furthered by the French bourgeoisie's keen fear of losing its political and military hegemony in Europe.

Hence it follows that the successes scored by the anti-fascist movement in France, of which Comrades Thorez and Cachin have spoken here, and over which we so heartily rejoice, are still far from indicating that the toiling masses have definitely succeeded in blocking the road to fascism. I must emphatically stress once more the full importance of the tasks of the French working class in the struggle against fascism, of which I already spoke in my report.

It would likewise be dangerous to cherish illusions regarding the weakness of fascism in other countries where it does not enjoy a broad mass base. We have the example of such countries as Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Finland, where fascism, although it had no broad base, came to power, relying on the armed forces of the State, and then sought to broaden its base by making use of the State apparatus.

Comrade Dutt was right in his contention that there was a tendency amongst us to contemplate fascism in general, without taking into account the specific features of the fascist movement in the various countries, erroneously classifying all reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie as fascism and going as far as calling the entire non-Communist camp fascist. The struggle against fascism was not strengthened but rather weakened in consequence.

Even now we still have survivals of a stereotyped approach to the question of fascism. When some comrades assert that Roosevelt's "New Deal" represents an ever clearer and more pronounced form of the development of the bourgeoisie towards fascism than the "National Government" in Great Britain, for example, is this not a manifestation of such a stereotyped approach to the question? One must indeed be a confirmed addict of the use of hackneyed schemes not to see that the most reactionary circles of American finance

capital which are attacking Roosevelt represent first and foremost the very force which is stimulating and organising the fascist movement in the United States. Not to see the beginnings of real fascism in the United States behind the hypocritical outpourings of these circles "in defence of the democratic rights of the American citizen" is tantamount to misleading the working class in the struggle against its worst enemy.

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries there can be no question of the kind of fascism that we are accustomed to see in Germany, Italy and other capitalist countries. Here we must study and take into account the quite different economic, political and historical conditions, in accordance with which fascism is assuming and will continue to assume peculiar forms of its own.

Unable to approach the phenomena of real life concretely, some comrades, who suffer from mental laziness, substitute general, non-committal *formulas* for a careful and concrete study of the *actual* situation and the relationship of class forces. Unlike *snipers* who shoot with unerring aim, they remind us of those "crack" riflemen who regularly and unfailingly *miss* the target, shooting either too high or too low, too near or too far. But we, comrades, as Communists, active in the labour movement, as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, want to be snipers who unfailingly *hit* the target. (*Prolonged applause.*)

THE UNITED PROLETARIAN FRONT AND THE ANTI-FASCIST PEOPLE'S FRONT

Some comrades are quite needlessly racking their brains over the problem of *what to begin with—the united proletarian front or the anti-fascist people's front.*

Some say that we cannot start forming the anti-fascist people's front until we have organised a solid united front of the proletariat.

Others argue that, since the establishment of the united proletarian front meets with the resistance of Social-Democracy in a number of countries, it is better to start at once with building up the people's front, and then develop the united working-class front on this basis.

Evidently both groups fail to understand that the united proletarian front and the anti-fascist people's front are interconnected and interwoven, the one passing into the other in the process of the practical struggle against fascism as a

consequence of the *living dialectics of the struggle*, and that there is certainly no Chinese wall to keep them apart.

For it cannot be seriously supposed that it is impossible to establish a genuine anti-fascist people's front without securing the unity of action of the working class itself, the *guiding force* of this anti-fascist people's front. At the same time, the further development of the united proletarian front depends, to a considerable degree, upon its transformation into a people's front against fascism.

Comrades! Just picture to yourselves a devotee of cut-and-dried theories of this kind, gazing upon our resolution and contriving his pet scheme with the zeal of a true pedant:

First, local united proletarian front from below;

Then, regional united front from below;

Thereafter, united front from above, passing through the same stages;

Then, unity in the trade union movement;

After that, the enlistment of other anti-fascist parties;

This to be followed by the extended people's front, from above and from below;

After which the movement must be raised to a higher level, politicalised, revolutionised, and so on and so forth. (*Laughter.*)

You will say, comrades, that this is sheer nonsense. I agree with you. But the unfortunate thing is that in some form or other this kind of sectarian nonsense is still to be found quite frequently in our ranks.

How does the matter really stand? Of course, we must strive everywhere for a broad anti-fascist people's front of struggle against fascism. But in a number of countries we shall not get beyond general talk about the people's front, unless we succeed in mobilising the masses of the workers for the purpose of breaking down the resistance of Social-Democracy to the formation of a proletarian, united front of struggle. This is how the matter stands, above all in Great Britain where the working class comprises the majority of the population and where the bulk of the working class follows the lead of the trade unions and the Labour Party. That is how matters stand in Belgium and in the Scandinavian countries where the numerically small Communist Parties must face strong mass trade unions and numerically large Social-Democratic Parties.

In these countries the Communists would commit a very

serious political mistake if they shirked the struggle to establish a united proletarian front under cover of general talk about a people's front which cannot be formed without the participation of the mass working-class organisations. In order to bring about a genuine people's front in these countries, the Communists must carry out an enormous amount of political and organisational work among the masses of the workers. They must overcome the preconceived ideas of these masses who regard their mass reformist organisations as already the embodiment of proletarian unity. They must convince these masses that the establishment of the united front with the Communists means a shift on the part of those masses to the position of the class struggle, and that this shift alone will guarantee success in the struggle against the offensive of capital and fascism. We shall not overcome these difficulties by setting ourselves much wider tasks here. On the contrary, in fighting to remove these difficulties we shall thus actually, and not in words alone, prepare the ground for the creation of a genuine people's front of battle against fascism, against the capitalist offensive and against the threat of imperialist war.

The issue is a different one in countries like Poland, where a strong peasant movement is developing side by side with the labour movement, where the peasant masses have their own organisations which are becoming radicalised as a result of the agrarian crisis, where national oppression evokes indignation among the national minorities. Here the development of the general people's front of struggle will proceed parallel with the development of the united proletarian front, and at times in this type of country the movement for a general people's front may even outstrip the movement for a working-class front.

Take a country like Spain, which is in the process of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Can it be said that, because the proletariat is split up into numerous small organisations, complete fighting unity of the working class must first be established here before a workers' and peasants' front against Lerroux and Gil Robles is created? By tackling the question in this way we would isolate the proletariat from the peasantry, would in effect be withdrawing the slogan of the agrarian revolution, would make it easier for the enemies of the people to disunite the proletariat and the peasantry, and set the peasantry in opposition to the working class. Yet this, comrades, as is well known, was one of the main reasons why the working

class was defeated in the October events of 1934.

However, one thing must not be forgotten : in all countries where the proletariat is comparatively small in numbers, where the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeois strata predominate, it is all the more necessary to bend every effort to set up a firm united front of the working class itself, so that it may be able to take its place as the leading factor with regard to all the toilers.

Thus, comrades, in attacking the problem of the proletarian front and the people's front, there can be no general panacea suitable for all cases, all countries, all people. In this matter universalism, the application of "one and the same recipe to all countries is equivalent, if you will allow me to say so, to ignorance ; and ignorance should be flogged, even when it stalks about, nay, particularly when it stalks about, in the cloak of universal cut-and-dried schemes. (*Applause.*)

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND ITS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE UNITED FRONT OF THE PROLETARIAT

Comrades, in view of the tactical problems confronting us, it is very important to give a correct reply to the question of whether Social-Democracy at the present time is still the principal bulwark of the bourgeoisie, and if so, where ?

Some of the comrades who participated in the discussion (Comrades Florin, Dutt) touched upon this question, but in view of its importance a fuller reply must be given to it, for it is a question which workers of all trends, particularly Social-Democratic workers, are asking and cannot help asking.

It must be borne in mind that in a number of countries the position of Social-Democracy in the bourgeois state, and its attitude towards the bourgeoisie, have been undergoing a change.

In the first place, the crisis has thoroughly shaken the position of even the most secure section of the working class, the so-called aristocracy of labour, upon which, as we know, Social-Democracy relies for support. This section, too, is beginning more and more to revise its views as to the expediency of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

Second, as I pointed out in my report, the bourgeoisie in a number of countries is itself compelled to abandon bourgeois democracy and resort to the terroristic form of its dicta-

torship, depriving Social-Democracy not only of its previous position in the political system of finance capital, but also, under certain conditions, of its legal status, persecuting and even suppressing it.

Third, under the influence of the lessons learnt from the defeat of the workers in Germany, Austria and Spain, a defeat which was largely the result of the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and, on the other hand, under the influence of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union as a result of Bolshevik policy and the application of living, revolutionary Marxism, the Social-Democratic workers are becoming revolutionised, are beginning to turn to the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The joint effect of all this has been to make it increasingly difficult, and in some countries actually impossible, for Social-Democracy to preserve its former role of bulwark of the bourgeoisie.

Failure to understand this is particularly harmful in those countries in which the fascist dictatorship has deprived Social-Democracy of its legal status. From this point of view the self-criticism of those German comrades, who in their speeches mentioned the necessity of ceasing to cling to the letter of obsolete formulas and decisions concerning Social-Democracy, of ceasing to ignore the changes that have taken place in its position, was correct. It is clear that if we ignore these changes, it will lead to a distortion of our policy in favour of establishing the unity of the working class, and will facilitate the sabotage of the united front by the reactionary elements of the Social-Democratic leaders.

The process of revolutionisation in the ranks of the Social-Democratic Parties now going on in all countries is developing unevenly. It must not be imagined that the Social-Democratic workers who are becoming revolutionised will *at once* and on a mass scale adopt the position of consistent class struggle, and will *straightway* unite with the Communists without any intermediate stages. In a number of countries this will be a more or less difficult, a more or less complicated and prolonged process, essentially dependent, at any rate, on the correctness of our policy and tactics. We must even reckon with the possibility that, in passing from the position of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie to the position of class struggle against the bourgeoisie, some Social-Democratic Parties and organisations will continue to exist for a time as independent

organisations or parties. In such event there can, of course, be no thought of such Social-Democratic organisations or parties being regarded as a bulwark of the bourgeoisie.

It cannot be expected that those Social-Democratic workers who are under the influence of the ideology of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, which has been instilled in them in the course of decades, will part with this ideology of their own accord, actuated solely by objective causes. No. It is our business, the business of the Communists, to help them free themselves from the hold of reformist ideology. The work of explaining the principles and programme of Communism must be carried on patiently, in a comradely fashion, and must be adapted to the degree of development of individual Social-Democratic workers. Our criticism of Social-Democracy must become more specific and systematic, and must be based on the experience of the Social-Democratic masses themselves.

It must be borne in mind that primarily by utilising their experience in the joint struggle with the Communists against the class enemy will it be possible and necessary to facilitate and accelerate the revolutionary development of the Social-Democratic workers. There is no more effective means of the Social-Democratic workers abandoning their vacillation and doubts than participation in the proletarian united front.

We shall do all in our power to make it easier, not only for the Social-Democratic workers, but also for those leading members of Social-Democratic Parties and organisations who sincerely desire to adopt the revolutionary class position, to work and fight with us against the class enemy. At the same time we declare that any Social-Democratic functionary, lower official, or worker who continues to uphold the disruptive tactics of the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders, who come out against the united front and thus directly or indirectly aid the class enemy, will thereby incur at least equal guilt before the working class as those who are historically responsible for having supported the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration, the policy which in a number of European countries doomed the revolution in 1918 and cleared the way for fascism.

The attitude adopted towards the united front is the dividing line between the reactionary sections of Social-Democracy and the sections that are becoming revolutionary. Our assistance to the latter will be the more effective, the more

We intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of Social-Democracy participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie. And within the Left camp the self-determination of the various elements will take place the sooner, the more determinedly the Communists fight for a united front with the Social-Democratic Parties. The experience of the class struggle and the participation of the Social-Democrats in the united front movement will show who in that camp will prove to be "left" merely in words and who is really Left.

THE UNITED FRONT GOVERNMENT

While the attitude of Social-Democracy towards the practical realisation of the united proletarian front is, generally speaking, the principal indication in every country of whether the previous role in the bourgeois state of the Social-Democratic Party or of its individual parts has changed, and if so, to what extent, *the attitude of the Social-Democrats on the issue of a united front government will be a particularly clear test.*

When a situation arises in which the question of creating a united front government becomes an immediate practical problem, this issue will become decisive, the touchstone for the policy of Social-Democracy in the given country: either jointly with the fascist-bound bourgeoisie against the working class, or jointly with the revolutionary proletariat against fascism and reaction, not alone in words but in deeds. That is how the question will inevitably be presented at the time the united front government is formed as well as while it is in power.

I think that enough was said in my report about the character of the united front government and the anti-fascist people's front government, as well as the conditions of their formation, to provide general tactical direction. To expect us over and above this to indicate all possible forms and all conditions under which such governments may be formed would mean but to invite futile conjecture.

I would like to utter a note of warning against oversimplification or the application of any hard-and-fast rules in this question. Life is more complex than any scheme. For example, it would be wrong to imagine that the united front government is an *indispensable stage* on the road to the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. That is just as wrong

as the former assertion that there will be no *intermediary stages* in the fascist countries and that fascist dictatorship is *certain to be immediately superseded* by proletarian dictatorship.

The whole question boils down to this: will the proletariat itself be prepared at the decisive moment for the direct overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of its own power, and will it be able in that event to secure the support of its allies? Or, will the movement of the united proletarian front and the anti-fascist people's front at the particular stage be in a position only to suppress or overthrow fascism, without directly proceeding to abolish the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie? In the latter case it would be an intolerable piece of political shortsightedness, and not serious revolutionary politics, to use this alone as a ground for refusing to create and support a united front or a people's front government.

It is likewise not difficult to understand that the establishment of a united front government in countries where fascism is not yet in power is something *different* from the creation of such a government in countries where the fascist dictatorship holds sway. In the latter countries a united front government can be created *only in the process of overthrowing fascist rule*. In countries where the *bourgeois-democratic revolution* is developing, a people's front government may become the government of the democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry.

As I have already pointed out in my report, the Communists will do all in their power to support a united front government to the extent that the latter will really fight against the enemies of the people and grant freedom of action to the Communist Party and to the working class. The question of whether the Communists will take part in the Government will be determined entirely by the actual situation prevailing at the time. Such questions will be settled as they arise. No handy recipes can be prescribed in advance.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

Comrade Lenski pointed out in his speech that "while mobilising the masses to repel the onslaught of fascism against the rights of the toilers, the Polish Party at the same time had its misgivings about formulating positive democratic demands in order not to create democratic illusions among the masses."

The Polish Party is, of course, not the only one in which such fear of formulating positive democratic demands exists in one way or another.

Where does that fear come from, comrades? It comes from an incorrect, non-dialectical conception of our attitude towards bourgeois democracy. We, Communists, are unswerving upholders of Soviet democracy, the great prototype of which is the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union where the introduction of equal suffrage, and the direct and secret ballot is proclaimed by resolution of the Seventh Congress of Soviets at the same time that the last vestiges of bourgeois democracy are being wiped out in the capitalist countries. This Soviet democracy presupposes the victory of the proletarian revolution, the conversion of private property in the means of production into public property, the embarking of the overwhelming majority of the people on the road to Socialism. This democracy does not represent a final form; it develops and will continue to develop in proportion as further progress is made in socialist construction, in the creation of classless society and in the overcoming of the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in the minds of people.

But today the millions of toilers living under capitalism are faced with the necessity of taking a definite stand on *these forms* in which the *rule of the bourgeoisie* is clad in the various countries. We are not anarchists and it is not at all a matter of indifference to us what kind of political regime exists in any given country: whether a bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy, even with democratic rights and liberties greatly curtailed, or a bourgeois dictatorship in its open, fascist form. Being upholders of Soviet democracy, *we shall defend every inch of the democratic gains which the working class has wrested in the course of years of stubborn struggle, and shall resolutely fight to extend these gains.*

How great were the sacrifices of the British working class before it secured the right to strike, a legal status for its trade unions, the right of assembly and freedom of the press, extension of the franchise, and other rights! How many tens of thousands of workers gave their lives in the revolutionary battles fought in France in the nineteenth century to obtain the elementary rights and the lawful opportunity of organising their forces for the struggle against the exploiters. The proletariat of all countries has shed much of its blood to win

bourgeois-democratic liberties, and will naturally fight with all its strength to retain them.

Our attitude towards bourgeois democracy is not the same under all conditions. For instance, at the time of the October Revolution, the Russian Bolsheviki engaged in a life-and-death struggle against all political parties which opposed the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship under the slogan of the defence of bourgeois democracy. The Bolsheviks fought these parties because the banner of bourgeois democracy had at that time become the standard around which all counter-revolutionary forces mobilised to challenge the victory of the proletariat. The situation is quite different in the capitalist countries at present. Now the fascist counter-revolution is attacking bourgeois democracy in an effort to establish a most barbaric regime of exploitation and suppression of the toiling masses. Now the toiling masses in a number of capitalist countries are faced with the necessity of making a *definite* choice, and of making it today, not between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism.

Besides, we have now a situation which differs from that which existed, for example, in the epoch of capitalist stabilisation. At that time the fascist danger was not as acute as it is today. At that time it was bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy that the revolutionary workers were facing in a number of countries and it was against bourgeois democracy that they were concentrating their fire. In Germany, they fought against the Weimar Republic, not because it was a republic, but because it was a *bourgeois* republic, which was suppressing the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, especially in 1918-20 and in 1923.

But could the Communists maintain this stand also when the fascist movement began to raise its head, when, for instance, in 1932, the fascists in Germany were organising and arming hundreds of thousands of storm troopers against the working class? Of course not. It was the mistake of the Communists in a number of countries, particularly in Germany, that they failed to take into account the changes which had taken place, but continued to repeat those slogans, maintain those tactical positions which had been correct a few years before, especially when the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship was an immediate issue, and when the entire German counter-revo-

*lution was rallying under the banner of the Weimar Republic, as it did in 1918-20.

And the circumstance that even today we must still make reference to fear, in our ranks, of launching positive democratic slogans indicates how little our comrades have mastered the Marxist-Leninist method of approaching such important problems of our tactics. Some say that the struggle for democratic rights may divert the workers from the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. It may not be amiss to recall what Lenin said on this question :

"It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the struggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from the Socialist revolution, or obscure, or overshadow it, etc. On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 268.)

These words should be firmly fixed in the memories of all our comrades, bearing in mind that in history the great revolutions have grown out of small movements for the defence of the elementary rights of the working class. But in order to be able to link up the struggle for democratic rights with the struggle of the working class for socialism, it is necessary first and foremost to discard any cut-and-dried approach to the questions of defence of bourgeois democracy. (*Applause.*)

A CORRECT LINE ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH

Comrades, it is clear, of course, that for the Communist International and each of its Sections, the fundamental thing is to work out a correct line. But a correct line alone is not enough for concrete leadership in the class struggle.

For that, a number of conditions must be fulfilled, above all the following :

First, *organisational guarantees* that adopted decisions will be carried out in practice and that all obstacles in the way will be resolutely overcome. What Comrades Stalin said at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union about the conditions necessary to carry out the line of the Party, can and should bear, in its entirety, also on the decisions which our Congress adopts.

Comrade Stalin said :

"Some people think that it is sufficient to draw up a correct Party line, proclaim it from the housetops, enunciate it in the form of general theses and resolutions and carry them unanimously in order to make victory come of itself, automatically, so to speak. This, of course, is wrong. Those who think like that are greatly mistaken. Only incorrigible bureaucrats and office rats can think that. As a matter of fact, these successes and victories were obtained, not automatically, but as a result of a fierce struggle to carry out the Party line. Victory never comes by itself—it has to be dragged by the hand. Good resolutions and declarations in favour of the general line of the Party are only a beginning; they merely express the desire to win, but it is not victory. After the correct line has been given, after a correct solution of the problem has been found, success depends on the manner in which the work is organised, on the organisation of the struggle for the application of the line of the Party, on the proper selection of workers, on supervising the fulfilment of the decisions of the leading organs. Without this the correct line of the Party and the correct solutions are in danger of being severely damaged. More than that, after the correct political line has been given, the organisational work decides everything, including the fate of the political line itself, i.e., whether it is fulfilled or not." (Stalin, "Report on the Work of the Central Committee." See *Socialism Victorious*, pp. 78-9.)

It is hardly necessary to add anything to these striking words of Comrade Stalin, which must become a guiding principle in all the work of our Parties.

Another condition is the ability to convert decisions of the Communist International and its Sections into decisions of the broad masses themselves. This is all the more necessary now, when we are faced with the task of organising a united front of the proletariat and drawing the broad masses of the people into an anti-fascist people's front. The political and tactical genius of Lenin and Stalin is evinced most clearly and most vividly in their masterful ability to get the masses to understand the correct line and the slogans of the Party through their own experience. If we follow up the history of Bolshevism, that greatest of treasure houses of the political strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement, we can see for ourselves that the Bolsheviks never substituted methods of leading the Party for methods of leading the masses.

Comrade Stalin pointed that one of the peculiarities of the tactics of the Russian Bolsheviks in the period of prepara-

tion for the October Revolution consisted in their ability correctly to determine the path and the turns which naturally lead the masses to the slogans of the Party, to the very "threshold of the revolution," helping them to sense, to test and to realise from their own experience the correctness of these slogans. They did not confuse leadership of the Party with leadership of the masses, but clearly saw the difference between leadership of the first kind and leadership of the second kind. In this way they worked out tactics as the science, not only of Party leadership, but also of the leadership of the millions of toilers.

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that *the broad masses cannot assimilate our decisions unless we learn to speak the language which the masses understand.* We do not always know how to speak simply, concretely, in images which are familiar and intelligible to the masses. We are still loath to dispense with abstract formulas which we have learnt by rote. As a matter of fact, if you scan our leaflets, newspapers, resolutions and theses, you will find that they are often written in a language and style so heavy that they are difficult for even our Party functionaries to understand, let alone the rank-and-file workers.

If we reflect, comrades, that workers, especially in fascist countries, who distribute or only read these leaflets risk their very lives by doing so, we shall realise still more clearly the need of writing for the masses in a language which they understand, so that the sacrifices made may not have been in vain.

The same applies in no less degree to our oral agitation and propaganda. We must admit quite frankly that in this respect the fascists have often proven more dexterous and flexible than many of our comrades.

I recall, for example, a meeting of unemployed in Berlin before Hitler's accession to power. It was at the time of the trial of those notorious swindlers and speculators, the Sklarek brothers, which dragged on for several months. A National Socialist speaker in addressing the meeting made demagogic use of that trial, to further his own ends. He referred to the swindles, the bribery and other crimes committed by the Sklarek brothers, emphasised that the trial had been dragging for months and figured out how many hundreds of thousands of marks it had already cost the German people. To the accompaniment of loud applause the speaker declared that such bandits as the Sklarek brothers should have been shot

without any ado, and the money wasted on the trial should have gone to the unemployed.

A Communist rose and asked for the floor. The chairman at first refused to recognise him but under the pressure of the audience which wanted to hear from the Communists he had to let him speak. When the Communist got upon the platform everybody awaited with tense expectation what the Communist speaker would have to say. Well, what did he say?

"Comrades," he began in a loud and strong voice, "the Plenum of the Communist International has just closed. It showed the way to the salvation of the working class. The chief task it puts before you, comrades, is: *'to win the majority of the working class....'* (Laughter.) The Plenum pointed out that the unemployed movement must be 'politicalised.' (Laughter.) The Plenum calls on us to raise it to a higher level." (Laughter.)

He went on in the same strain, evidently under the impression that he was "explaining" authentic decisions of the Plenum.

Could such a speech appeal to the unemployed? Could they find any satisfaction in the fact that first we intended to politicalise, then revolutionise, and finally mobilise them in order to raise their movement to a higher level? (Laughter, applause.)

Sitting in a corner of the hall, I observed with chagrin how the unemployed, who had been so eager to hear a Communist in order to find out from him what to do concretely, began to yawn and display unmistakable signs of disappointment. And I was not at all surprised when towards the end the chairman rudely cut our speaker short without any protest from the meeting.

This unfortunately is not the only case of its kind in our agitational work. Nor were such cases confined to Germany. To agitate in such fashion means to agitate against one's own cause. It is high time to put an end once and for all to these, to say the least, childish methods of agitation.

During my report, the chairman, Comrade Kuusinen, received a characteristic letter from the floor of the Congress addressed to me. Let me read it:

"In your speech at the Congress, please take up the following question, namely, that all resolutions and decisions adopted in the future by the Communist International be written so that not only trained Communists can get the

meaning, but that any working man reading the material of the Comintern might without any preliminary training be able to see at once what the Communists want, and of what service Communism is to mankind. Some Party leaders forget this. They must be reminded of it, and very strongly, too. Also that agitation for Communism be conducted in understandable language."

I do not know exactly who is the author of this letter, but I have no doubt that this comrade voiced in his letter the opinion and desire of millions of workers. Many of our comrades think that the more high-sounding words, and the more formulas and theses unintelligible to the masses they use, the better their agitation and propaganda, forgetting that the greatest leaders and theoreticians of the working class of our epoch, *Lenin* and *Stalin*, have always spoken and written in highly popular language readily understood by the broad masses.

Everyone of us must make this a law, a Bolshevik law, an elementary rule:

When writing or speaking always have in mind the rank-and-file worker who must understand you. must believe in your appeal and be ready to follow you! You must have in mind those for whom you write, to whom you speak. (Applause.)

CADRES*

Comrades, our best resolutions will remain scraps of paper if we lack the people who are to put them into effect. Unfortunately, however, I must state that the problem of *cadres*, one of the most important questions that confront us, received practically no attention at this Congress. The report of the Executive Committee of the Communist International was discussed for seven days. There were many speakers from various countries, but only a few, and they only in passing, discussed this question, so extremely vital for the Communist Parties and the labour movement. In their practical work our Parties have not yet realised by far that *people, cadres, decide everything*. They are unable to do what Comrade *Stalin* taught us to do, namely, cultivate cadres "as a gardener cul-

**Cadres*—here referring to active party workers and functionaries, or officials.—*Translator*.

tivates his favourite fruit tree," "to appreciate people, to appreciate cadres, to appreciate every worker who can be of use to our common cause."

An indifferent attitude on the question of cadres is all the more impermissible for the reason that we are constantly losing some of the most valuable of our cadres in the struggle. For we are not a learned society but a militant movement which is constantly on the firing line. Our most energetic, most courageous and most class-conscious elements are in the front ranks. It is precisely these front-line men that the enemy hunts down, murders, throws into jail, puts in concentration camps and subjects to excruciating torture, particularly in fascist countries. This creates the very urgent necessity of constantly replenishing the ranks, cultivating and training new cadres as well as carefully preserving the existing cadres.

The question of cadres is of particular urgency for the additional reason that under our influence the mass united front movement is gaining momentum and bringing forward many thousands of new working-class militants. Moreover, it is not only young revolutionary elements, not only workers just becoming revolutionary who have never before participated in a political movement, that stream into our ranks. Very often former members and activists of the Social-Democratic Parties also join us. These new cadres require special attention, particularly in the illegal Communist Parties, the more so because these cadres with their poor theoretical training frequently come up against serious political problems in their practical work which they must solve for themselves.

The problem of what shall be the *correct policy with regard to cadres* is a very serious one for our Parties, as well as for the Young Communist League and for all other mass organisations—for the entire revolutionary labour movement.

What does a correct policy with regard to cadres imply?

First, *knowing one's people*. As a rule, there is no systematic study of cadres in our Parties. Only recently have the Communist Parties of France and Poland and, in the East, the Communist Party of China, achieved certain successes in this direction. The Communist Party of Germany, before its underground period, had also undertaken a study of its cadres. The experience of these Parties has shown that as soon as they began to study their people, Party workers were discovered who had remained unnoticed before. On the other hand, the Parties began to be purged of alien elements who were ideo-

logically and politically harmful. It is sufficient to point to the example of Celor and Barbe in France who when put under the Bolshevik microscope turned out to be agents of the class enemy and were thrown out of the Party. In Poland and in Hungary the verification of cadres made it easier to discover nests of provocateurs, agents of the enemy, who had sedulously concealed their identity.

Second, *proper promotion of cadres*. Promotion should not be something casual but one of the normal functions of the Party. It is bad when promotion is made exclusively on the basis of narrow Party considerations, without regard to whether the Communist promoted has contact with the masses or not. Promotion should take place on the basis of the ability of the various Party workers to discharge particular functions, and of their popularity among the masses. We have examples in our Parties of promotions which have produced excellent results. For instance, we have a Spanish woman-Communist, sitting in the Presidium of this Congress, Comrade Dolores. Two years ago she was still a rank-and-file Party worker. But in the very first clashes with the class enemy she proved to be an excellent agitator and fighter. Subsequently promoted to the leading body of the Party, she has proved herself a most worthy member of that body. (*Applause.*)

I could point to a number of similar cases in several other countries, but in the majority of cases promotions are made in an unorganised and haphazard manner, and therefore are not always fortunate. Sometimes moralisers, phrase-mongers and chatter-boxes who actually harm the cause are promoted to leading positions.

Third, *the ability to use people to best advantage*. We must be able to ascertain and utilise the valuable qualities of every single active worker. There are no ideal people: we must take them as they are and correct their weaknesses and shortcomings. We know of glaring examples in our Parties of the wrong utilisation of good, honest Communists who might have been very useful had they been given work that they were better fit to do.

Fourth, *proper distribution of cadres*. First of all, we must see to it that the main links of the movement are in the charge of strong people who have contacts with the masses, have sprung from the very depths of the masses, who have initiative and are staunch. The more important districts should have an appropriate number of such activists. In capitalist

countries it is not an easy matter to transfer cadres from one place to another. Such a task encounters a number of obstacles and difficulties, including lack of funds, family considerations, etc., difficulties which must be taken into account and properly overcome. But usually we neglect to do this altogether.

Fifth, *systematic assistance to cadres*. This assistance should take the form of careful instruction, comradely control, rectification of shortcomings and mistakes and concrete, everyday guidance.

Sixth, *proper care for the preservation of cadres*. We must learn promptly to withdraw Party workers to the rear whenever circumstances so require, and replace them by others. We must demand that the Party leadership, particularly in countries where the Parties are illegal, assume paramount responsibility for the preservation of cadres. (Applause.) The proper preservation of cadres also presupposes highly efficient organisation of secrecy in the Party. In certain of our Parties many comrades think that the Parties are sufficiently prepared for underground existence even though they have reorganised themselves only formally, according to ready-made rules. We had to pay very dearly for having started the real work of reorganisation only after the Party had gone underground, under the direct heavy blows of the enemy. Remember the severe losses the Communist Party of Germany suffered during its transition to underground conditions! Its experience should serve as a serious warning to those of our Parties which today are still legal but may lose their legal status tomorrow.

Only a correct policy in regard to cadres will enable our Parties to develop and utilise all available forces to the utmost and obtain from the enormous reservoir of the mass movement ever fresh reinforcements of new and better active workers.

What should be our *main criteria* in selecting cadres?

First, *absolute devotion to the cause of the working class, loyalty to the Party*, tested in face of the enemy—in battle, in prison, in court.

Second, the closest possible *contact with the masses*. The comrades concerned must be wholly absorbed in the interests of the masses, feel the life pulse of the masses, know their sentiments and requirements. The prestige of the leaders of our Party organisation should be based, first of all, on the fact that the masses regard them as their leaders, and are

convinced through their own experience of their ability as leaders, and of their determination and self-sacrifice in struggle.

Third, *ability independently to find one's bearings* and not to be afraid of *assuming responsibility in taking decisions*. He who fears to take responsibility is not a leader. He who is unable to display initiative, who says: "I will do only what I am told," is not a Bolshevik. Only he is a real Bolshevik leader who does not lose his head at moments of defeat, who does not get a swelled head at moments of success, who displays indomitable firmness in carrying out decisions. Cadres develop and grow best when they are placed in the position of having to solve concrete problems of the struggle independently, and are aware that they are fully responsible for their decisions.

Fourth, *discipline and Bolshevik hardening* in the struggle against the class enemy as well as in their irreconcilable opposition to all deviations from the Bolshevik line.

We must place all the more emphasis on these conditions which determine the correct selection of cadres, because in practice preference is very often given to a comrade who, for example, may be able to write well and be a good speaker but is not a man or woman of action, is not as suited for the struggle as some other comrade who perhaps may not be able to write or speak so well, but is a staunch comrade, possessing initiative and contacts with the masses, and is capable of going into battle and leading others into battle. (*Applause.*) Have there not been ever so many cases of sectarians, doctrinaires or moralisers crowding out loyal mass workers, genuine working-class leaders?

Our leading cadres should combine the knowledge of *what they must do—with Bolshevik stamina, revolutionary strength of character and the will power to carry it through.*

In connection with the question of cadres permit me, comrades, to dwell also on the great role which the *International Labour Defence* is called upon to play in relation to the cadres of the labour movement. The material and moral assistance which the I.L.D. organisations render to our prisoners and their families, to political emigrants, to persecuted revolutionaries and anti-fascists, has saved the lives and preserved the strength and fighting capacity of thousands upon thousands of most valuable fighters of the working class in many countries. Those of us who have been in jail have found out directly through our own experience the enormous

significance of the activity of the I.L.D. (*Applause.*)

By its activity, the I.L.D. has won the affection, attachment and profound gratitude of hundreds of thousands of proletarians, and of revolutionary elements among the peasantry and professional people. It must become, so to speak, a sort of "Red Cross" of the united front of the proletariat and the anti-fascist people's front, embracing millions of toiling people—the "Red Cross" of the army of the toiling classes embattled against fascism, fighting for peace and socialism. If the I.L.D. is to perform its part successfully, it must train thousands of its own active militants, a multitude of *I.L.D. workers* of its own, answering in their character and capacity the *special purposes* of this extremely important organisation.

Under present conditions when bourgeois reaction is growing, when fascism is raging and the class struggle is becoming more acute, the role of the I.L.D. is increasing immensely. The task now before the I.L.D. is to become a genuine mass organisation of the toilers in all capitalist countries (particularly in fascist countries where it must adapt itself to the special conditions prevailing there).

And here I must say as categorically and as sharply as I possibly can that while a *bureaucratic* approach and a soulless attitude toward people is despicable in the labour movement taken in general, in the sphere of activity of the I.L.D. such an attitude is an evil bordering on the criminal. (*Applause.*) The fighters of the working class, the victims of reaction and fascism who are suffering agony in torture chambers and concentration camps, political emigrants and their families should all meet with the most sympathetic care and solicitude on the part of the organisations and functionaries of the I.L.D. (*Prolonged applause.*) The I.L.D. must still better appreciate and discharge its duty of assisting the fighters in the proletarian and anti-fascist movement, particularly in physically and morally preserving the cadres of the labour movement. The Communists and revolutionary workers who are active in the I.L.D. organisations must realise at every step the enormous responsibility they bear before the working class and the Communist International for the successful fulfilment of the role and tasks of the I.L.D. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, as you know, cadres receive their best training in the process of struggle, in surmounting difficulties and withstanding tests, in studying favourable and unfavourable examples of conduct. We have hundreds of examples of

splendid conduct in times of strikes, during demonstrations, in jail, in court. We have thousands of instances of heroism, but unfortunately also not a few cases of pigeon-heartedness, lack of firmness, and even desertion. We often forget these examples, both good and bad. We do not teach people to benefit by these examples. We do not show them what should be emulated and what rejected. We must study the conduct of our comrades and active workers during class conflicts, at police court hearings, in the jails and concentration camps, in court, etc. The good sides should be brought to light and held up as models to be followed, while all that which is rotten, non-Bolshevik and philistine is to be cast aside. Since the Leipzig trial we have had quite a number of comrades appearing before bourgeois and fascist courts who have shown that numerous cadres are growing up with an excellent understanding of *what* really constitutes Bolshevik conduct in court.

But how many even of you delegates to the Congress know the details of the trial of the railwaymen in Rumania, know about the trial of Fiete Schulz who was subsequently beheaded by the fascists in Germany, the trial of our valiant Japanese comrade, Itikawa, the trial of the Bulgarian revolutionary soldiers, and many other trials at which admirable examples of proletarian heroism were displayed? (*Storm of applause, all rise.*) Such worthy examples of proletarian heroism must be popularised, must be contrasted with the manifestations of faintheartedness, philistinism, and every kind of rot and frailty in our ranks and the ranks of the working class. These examples must be used most extensively in educating the cadres of the labour movement.

Comrades! Our Party leaders often complain that *there are no people*; that they are short of people for agitational and propaganda work, for the newspapers, the trade unions, for work among the youth, among women. Not enough, not enough—that is the cry. We simply haven't got the people. To this we could reply in the old, yet eternally new, words of Lenin:

"There are no people—yet there are enormous numbers of people. There are enormous numbers of people, because the working class and the most diverse strata of society, year after year, advance from their ranks an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest, who are ready to render all the assistance they can in the fight against absolutism, the intolerableness of which is not yet recognised by

all, but is nevertheless more and more acutely sensed by increasing masses of the people. At the same time we have no people, because we have no leaders, no political leaders, we have no talented organisers capable of organising extensive and at the same time uniform and harmonious work that would give employment to all forces, even the most inconsiderable." (Lenin, "What Is to be Done?" *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 142.)

These words of Lenin must be thoroughly grasped by our Parties and applied by them as a guide in their everyday work. There are plenty of people. They need only be discovered in our own organisations, during strikes and demonstrations, in various mass organisations of the workers, in united front bodies. They must be helped to grow in the course of their work and struggle; they must be put in such conditions where they can really be useful to the workers' cause.

Comrades, we Communists are people of action. Ours is the problem of practical struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialist war, the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. It is precisely this *practical* task that imposes upon the Communist cadres the obligation to equip themselves with *revolutionary theory*. For us *Stalin*, that greatest master of revolutionary action, has taught us; theory gives those engaged in practical work the power of orientation, clarity of vision, assurance in work, belief in the triumph of our cause.

But real revolutionary theory is irreconcilably hostile to any emasculated theorising, any futile toying with abstract definitions. *Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action*, Lenin used to say. It is *such* a theory that our cadres need, and they need it as badly as they need their daily bread, as they need air, water. Whoever really wishes to rid our work of deadening, stereotyped schemes, of pernicious scholasticism, must sear them out with a red-hot iron, both by *real, practical*, active struggle waged together with and at the head of the masses, and by untiring effort to grasp the mighty, fertile, all-powerful Bolshevik theory, the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin. (*Applause.*)

In this connection I consider it particularly necessary to draw your attention to the work of our *Party schools*. It is not pedants, moralisers or adepts at quoting that our schools must train. No! It is practical front-rank fighters in the cause of the working class that must leave their walls—people

who are front-rank fighters not only because of their boldness and readiness for self-sacrifice, but also because they see further than rank-and-file workers and know better than they the path that leads to the emancipation of the toilers. All sections of the Communist International must without any dilly-dallying seriously take up the question of the proper organisation of Party schools, in order to turn them into *smithies*, where these fighting cadres are to be forged.

The principal task of our Party schools, it seems to me, is to teach the Party and Young Communist League members there how to apply the Marxist-Leninist method to the concrete situation in particular countries, to definite conditions, not to the struggle against an enemy "in general" but against a particular, definite enemy. For this purpose it is necessary to study not merely the letter of Leninism, but its living revolutionary spirit.

There are two ways of training cadres in our Party schools :

First method : teaching people abstract theory, trying to give them the greatest possible dose of dry learning, coaching them how to write theses and resolutions in literary style, and only incidentally touching upon the problems of the particular country, of the particular labour movement, its history and traditions, and the experience of the Communist Party in question. Only incidentally !

Second method : such theoretical training in the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism as is based on a practical study by the student of the cardinal problems concerning the struggle of the proletariat in his own country. On returning to his practical work, the student will then be able to find his bearings independently, and *become an independent practical organiser and leader capable of leading the masses to battle against the class enemy.*

Not all graduates of our Party schools prove to be suitable timber. Many have phrases, abstractions, book knowledge and show of learning. But we need real, truly Bolshevik organisers and leaders of the masses. And we need them badly this very day. It does not matter if such students be unable to write good theses (though we need that very much, too) as long as they know how to organise and lead, undaunted by difficulties, capable of surmounting them.

Revolutionary theory is the generalised, summarised experience of the revolutionary movement. Communists must carefully utilise in their countries not only the experience of

the past but also the experience of the present struggle of other detachments of the international labour movement. However, correct utilisation of experience does not by any means denote *mechanical transposition* of ready-made forms and methods of struggle from one set of conditions to another set, from one country to another, as so often happens in our Parties. Bare imitation, simple copying of methods and forms of work, even of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in countries where capitalism is still supreme, may with the best of intentions result in harm rather than good, as has so often actually been the case. It is precisely from the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks that we must learn to apply effectually, to the specific conditions of life in each country, the *single international line*; in the struggle against capitalism we must learn pitilessly to cast aside, pillory and hold up to general ridicule all *phrase-mongering, use of hackneyed formulas, pedantry and doctrinairism*.

It is necessary to learn, comrades, to learn always, at every step, in the course of the struggle, at liberty and in jail. To learn and to fight, to fight and to learn. We must be able to combine the great teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin *with Stalin's firmness at work and in struggle, with Stalin's irreconcilability, on matters of principle, toward the class enemy and deviators from the Bolshevik line, with Stalin's fearlessness in face of difficulties, with Stalin's revolutionary realism* (Applause.)

Comrades! Never has any international congress of Communists aroused such keen interest on the part of world public opinion as we witness now in regard to our present Congress. We may say without fear of exaggeration that there is not a single serious newspaper, not a single political party, not a single more or less serious political or public personage that is not following the course of our Congress with the closest attention.

The eyes of millions of workers, peasants, ⁶small townspeople, office workers and intellectuals, of colonial peoples and oppressed nationalities are turned towards Moscow, the great capital of the *first* but not the *last* state of the international proletariat. (Applause.)

In this we see a confirmation of the enormous importance and urgency of the questions discussed at the Congress and of its decisions. The frenzied howls of the fascists of all countries, particularly of German fascism fuming at the mouth,

only confirms us in our belief that our decisions have indeed hit the mark. (*Applause.*)

In the dark night of bourgeois reaction and fascism, in which the class enemy is endeavouring to keep the toiling masses of the capitalist countries, the Communist International, the international Party of the Bolsheviks, stands out like a beacon, showing all mankind the one right way to emancipation from the yoke of capitalism, from fascist barbarity and the horrors of imperialist war.

The establishment of unity of action of the working class is a *decisive* stage on that road. Yes, unity of action by the organisations of the working class of every trend, the consolidation of its forces in all spheres of its activity and at all sectors of the class struggle.

The working class must achieve the unity of its *trade unions*. In vain do some reformist trade union leaders attempt to frighten the workers with the spectre of trade union democracy destroyed by the interference of the Communist Parties in the affairs of the united trade unions, by the existence of Communist fractions within the trade unions.

To depict us Communists as opponents of trade union democracy is sheer nonsense. We advocate and consistently uphold the right of the trade unions to decide their problems for themselves. We are even prepared to forgo the idea of creating Communist fractions in the trade unions if that is necessary to promote trade union unity. We are prepared to come to terms as to the independence of the united trade unions of all political parties. But we are decidedly opposed to any *dependence* of the trade unions on the bourgeoisie, and do not give up our basic point of view that it is impermissible for trade unions to adopt a *neutral* position in regard to the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The working class must strive to secure the *amalgamation* of all forces of the working-class youth and of all organisations of the anti-fascist youth, and win over that section of the toiling youth which has come under the demoralising influence of fascism and other enemies of the people.

The working class must and will achieve unity of action in all spheres of the labour movement. This will come about the sooner the more firmly and resolutely we Communists and revolutionary workers of all capitalist countries apply in practice the new tactical line adopted by our Congress in relation

to the most important urgent questions of the international labour movement.

We know that there are many difficulties ahead. Our path is not a smooth, asphalt road ; our path is not strewn with roses. The working class will have to overcome many an obstacle, obstacles in its own midst, as well ; it still faces the task above all of rendering completely harmless the disruptive role of the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy. Many are the sacrifices that will be exacted under the hammer blows of bourgeois reaction and fascism. The revolutionary ship of the proletariat will have to navigate among a multitude of submerged rocks before reaching safe port.

But the working class in the capitalist countries is to-day no longer what it was in 1914, at the beginning of the imperialist war, nor what it was in 1918, at the end of the war. The working class has behind it twenty years of rich experience and revolutionary trials, bitter lessons of a number of defeats, especially in Germany, Austria and Spain.

The working class has before it the inspiring example of the Soviet Union, the country of socialism victorious, an example of how the class enemy can be defeated, of how the working class can establish its own government and build socialist society.

The bourgeoisie no longer holds *undivided* dominion over the whole expanse of the world. Now *the victorious working class* rules over one-sixth of the globe, and Soviets control a vast stretch of territory in the great land of China.

The working class possesses a firm, well-knit revolutionary vanguard, the Communist International. It has a tried and recognised, a great and wise leader.—*Stalin*. (*Storm of applause, all rise. Cheers and shouts of greeting from all delegations.*)

The entire course of historical development, comrades, favours the cause of the working class. In vain are the efforts of the reactionaries, the fascists of every hue, the entire world bourgeoisie, to turn back the wheel of history. No, that wheel is turning forward and will continue to turn forward until a world-wide Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall have been established, until the final victory of Socialism throughout the whole world. (*Loud prolonged applause.*)

There is but one thing that the working class of the capitalist countries still lacks—unity in its own ranks.

So let the clarion call of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin,

the battle cry of the Communist International, ring out all the more loudly from this platform to the whole world :

Workers of the World, Unite !

(Loud prolonged applause. The vast hall resounds to shouts of "Hurrah !" "Rot Front !" "Banzai !" All rise and sing the "Internationale." The German delegation offers a triple "Rot Front !" Shouts of "Long live Comrade Stalin !" "Long live Comrade Dimitrov !" are heard in many languages. The delegations of the various countries in turn sing their songs of struggle. When the singing and cheering subside for a moment, Comrade Manuilsky exclaims :

"Long live the faithful and tested companion-at-arms of the great Stalin ; long live the helmsman of the Communist International, Comrade Dimitrov !"

Renewed enthusiastic applause and cheering, culminating in an ovation lasting fifteen to twenty minutes.)

FASCISM AND THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

*(Resolution on the Report of Georgi Dimitrov, Adopted
August 20, 1935 by the Seventh Congress of
the Communist International)*

1. FASCISM AND THE WORKING CLASS

1. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International declares that the alignment of class forces in the international arena and the tasks facing the labour movement of the world are determined by the following basic changes in the world situation:

(a) *The final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the Land of the Soviets*, a victory of world importance, which has enormously enhanced the power and role of the U.S.S.R. as the bulwark of the exploited and oppressed of the whole world, and is inspiring the toilers to struggle against capitalist exploitation, bourgeois reaction and fascism, for peace, and for the freedom and independence of the peoples.

(b) *The most profound economic crisis in the history of capitalism*, from which the bourgeoisie has tried to extricate itself by ruining the masses of the people, by dooming tens of millions of unemployed to starvation and extinction, and by lowering the standard of living of the toilers to an unprecedented extent. Despite a growth in industrial production in a number of countries and in increase in the profits of the financial magnates, the world bourgeoisie has not succeeded on the whole either in emerging from the crisis and the depression, or in retarding the further accentuation of the contradictions of capitalism. In some countries (France, Belgium, etc.) the crisis is continuing, in others it has entered a state of depression while in those countries where production has exceeded the pre-crisis level (Japan, Great Britain) new economic upheavals are impending.

(c) *The offensive of fascism, the advent to power of the fascists in Germany, the growth of the threat of a new imperialist world war and of an attack on the U.S.S.R.*, by means of which the capitalist world is seeking a way out of the impasse of its contradictions.

(d) *The political crisis*, expressed in the armed struggle of the workers in Austria and Spain against the fascists, a struggle which has not yet led to the victory of the proletariat over fascism, but which prevented the bourgeoisie from consolidating its fascist dictatorship; *the powerful anti-fascist movement in France*, which began with the February demonstration and the general strike of the proletariat in 1934.

(e) *The revolutionization of the toiling masses* throughout the whole capitalist world which is taking place under the influence of the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and of the world economic crisis, also on the basis of the lessons derived from the temporary defeat of the proletariat in the central part of Europe—in Germany—as well as in Austria and Spain, that is in countries *where the majority of the organised workers supported Social-Democratic Parties*. A powerful urge for unity of action is growing in the ranks of the international working class. The revolutionary movement in the colonial countries and the Soviet revolution in China are extending. The relationship of class forces on a world scale is changing more and more in the direction of a *growth of the forces of revolution*.

In this situation, the ruling bourgeoisie is seeking salvation more and more *in fascism*, in the establishment of the *open, terrorist dictatorship* of the most reactionary, the most chauvinist and the most imperialist elements of finance capital, with the aim of putting into effect extraordinary measures for despoiling the toilers, of preparing a predatory, imperialist war, of attacking the U.S.S.R. enslaving and dividing up China, and, on the basis of all this, preventing revolution. Finance capital is striving to curb the indignation of the petty-bourgeois masses against capitalism through the medium of its fascist agents who demagogically adopt their slogans to the moods of these sections of the population. Fascism is thus setting up for itself a mass basis and by directing these sections as a reactionary force against the working class, leads to the still greater enslavement of all the toilers by finance capital. In a number of countries fascism is already in power. But the growth of fascism and its victory attest not only to the weakness of the working class, disorganised as the result of Social-Democracy's disruptive policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, but also to the *weakness of the bourgeoisie itself* which is stricken with fear at the realisation of unity in the struggle of the working class, is in fear of revolution, and is no longer able to

maintain its dictatorship by the old methods of bourgeois democracy.

2. The most reactionary variety of fascism is the *German* type of fascism which brazenly calls itself National-Socialism, though it has absolutely nothing in common either with socialism, or with the defense of the real national interests of the common people, and merely fulfils the role of lackey of the big bourgeoisie and constitutes not only *bourgeois-nationalism* but also *bestial chauvinism*.

Fascist Germany is plainly showing to the whole world *what* the masses of the people may expect where fascism is victorious. The raving fascist government is annihilating the flower of the working class, its leaders and organizers, in jails and concentration camps. It has destroyed the trade unions, the co-operative societies, all legal organisations of the workers, as well as all other non-fascist political and cultural organizations. It has deprived the workers of the elementary right to defend their interests. It has converted a cultured country into a hotbed of obscurantism, barbarity and war. German fascism is the main instigator of a new imperialist war and comes forward as the *shock-troop of international counter-revolution*.

3. In emphasizing the growth of the threat of fascism in all capitalist countries, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International warns against any underestimation of the fascist danger. The Congress also rejects the fatalistic views regarding the inevitability of the victory of fascism. These views are basically incorrect and can only give rise to passivity and weaken the mass struggle against fascism. The working class can prevent the victory of fascism if it succeeds in bringing about unity in its struggle and by promptly developing its own militant action, does not allow fascism to gather strength; if it succeeds, by correct revolutionary leadership in rallying around itself the broad strata of toilers in town and country.

4. The victory of fascism is insecure. In spite of the formidable difficulties that fascist dictatorship creates for the working-class movement, the foundations of bourgeois domination are being further shaken under the rule of fascists. The internal conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie are becoming especially acute. The legalistic illusions of the masses are being shattered. The revolutionary hatred of the workers is accumulating. The baseness and falsity of the social demagogy of fascism is revealing itself more and more. Fascism

not only did not bring the masses the improvement in their material conditions which they had been promised, but has brought about a further increase of the profits of the capitalists by lowering the living standard of the toiling masses, has intensified their exploitation by a handful of financial magnates, and has carried out their further spoliation for the benefit of capital. The disillusionment of the urban petty-bourgeois strata and of the toiling peasants, deceived by the fascists, is growing. The mass base of fascism is disintegrating and narrowing down. The Congress, however, warns against the dangerous illusions of an automatic collapse of the fascist dictatorship, and points out that only the *united revolutionary struggle* of the working class at the head of all the toilers will bring about the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

5. In connection with the victory of fascism in Germany and the growth of the fascist danger in other countries, the class struggle of the proletariat, which is increasingly adopting the course of *determined resistance* to the fascist bourgeoisie, sharpened and continues to sharpen. *The united front movement* against the offensive of capital and fascism is developing in all capitalist countries. The National-Socialist terror raging in Germany, has lent powerful impetus to the *international united front* of the proletariat (the Leipzig trials, the campaign for the release of Dimitrov and the comrades jailed together with him, the campaign for the defence of Thaelmann, etc.)

Although the united front movement is as yet only in the initial stage of its development, the Communist and Social-Democratic workers in France, fighting side by side, succeeded in beating off the first attacks of fascism, thereby exerting a mobilizing influence on the united front movement internationally. The joint armed struggle of the Social-Democratic and Communist workers in Austria and Spain not only set a heroic example to the toilers of other countries but also demonstrated that a successful struggle against fascism could have been fully possible but for the sabotage of the Right and the wavering of the "Left" Social-Democratic leaders (in Spain there must be added the open treachery of the majority of the Anarcho-Syndicalist leaders), whose influence over the masses deprived the proletariat of determined revolutionary leadership and of clarity in the aims of the struggle.

6. The bankruptcy of the leading party of the Second International, of German Social-Democracy, which by its entire

policy facilitated the victory of fascism, also the failure of "Left" reformist Social-Democracy in Austria, which drew the broad masses away from the struggle even when the inevitable armed clash with fascism was drawing close, have tremendously increased the disillusionment of the Social-Democratic workers with the policy of the Social-Democratic Parties. The Second International is undergoing a profound crisis. Within the Social-Democratic Parties and the whole Second International a process of differentiation into *two main camps* is taking place—side by side with the existing camp of the *reactionary elements* who are trying to continue the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, there is being formed a camp of *elements who are becoming revolutionised*, elements who declare for the establishment of the united proletarian front and are adopting more and more the position of the revolutionary class struggle.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International welcomes the aspiration of the Social-Democratic workers to establish a united front with the Communists, regarding this as a sign that their class consciousness is growing, and that a beginning has been made towards overcoming the split in the ranks of the working class in the interest of a successful struggle against fascism, against the bourgeoisie.

11. THE UNITED FRONT OF THE WORKINGCLASS AGAINST FASCISM

In face of the towering menace of fascism to the working class and all the gains it has made, to all the toilers and their elementary rights, to the peace and liberty of the peoples, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International declares that *at the present historical stage it is the main and immediate task of the international labour movement to establish the united fighting front of the working class.* For a successful struggle against the offensive of capital, against the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie, against bourgeoisie, against fascism, the bitterest enemy of all the toilers who, without distinction of political views, have been deprived of all rights and liberties, it is imperative that unity of action be established between all sections of the working class, irrespective of what organization they belonged to, even before the majority of the working class unites on a common fighting platform for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the proletarian revolu-

tion. But it is precisely for this very reason that this task makes it the duty of the Communist Parties to take into consideration the changed circumstances and to apply the united front tactics *in a new manner* by seeking to reach agreements with the organisations of the toilers of various political trends for joint action on a factory, local, district, national and international scale.

With this as its point of departure, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International enjoins the Communist Parties to be guided by the following instructions when carrying out the united front tactics :

1. *The defence of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class : the defence of the latter against fascism*, must be the starting point and form the main content of the workers' united front in all capitalist countries. In order to set the broad masses in motion, such slogans and forms of struggle must be put forward as arise from the vital needs of the masses and from the level of their fighting capacity at the given stage of development. Communists must not limit themselves to merely issuing appeals to struggle for proletarian dictatorship, but must show the masses *what they are to do today* to defend themselves against capitalist plunder and fascist barbarity. They must strive, through the joint action of the labour organisations, to mobilize the masses around a *programme of demands that are calculated really to shift the burden of the consequences of the crisis on to the shoulders of the ruling classes, demands, the fight to realise which, disorganises fascism, hampers the preparations for imperialist war, weakens the bourgeoisie and strengthens the position of the proletariat.*

While preparing the working class for rapid shifts in the forms and methods of struggle as circumstances change, it is necessary to organize in proportion as the movement grows, the transition *from the defensive to the offensive* against capital, steering toward the organisation of a *mass political strike*, in which it is indispensable that the participation of the principal trade unions of the country should be secured.

2. Without for a moment giving up their independent work in the sphere of Communist education, organisation and mobilization of the masses, the Communists, in order to render the road to unity of action easier for the workers, must *strive to secure joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the toilers*

against the class enemies of the proletariat, on the basis of short—or long-term agreements. At the same time attention must be directed mainly to the development of mass action in the various localities, conducted by the lower organizations through local agreements.

Loyally fulfilling the conditions of the agreements, the Communists must promptly expose any sabotage of joint action by persons or organisations participating in the united front, and if the agreement is broken, must immediately appeal to the masses while continuing their tireless struggle for the restoration of the disrupted unity of action.

3. The forms in which the united proletarian front is realized, which depend on the condition and character of the labour organizations and on the concrete situation, must be varied in character. Such forms may include, for instance, joint action by the workers agreed upon *from case to case* on particular occasions, to secure individual demands, or on the basis of a common platform; action agreed upon in *individual enterprises or branches of industry*; action agreed on a *local, district, national or international scale*; action agreed upon in the organization of the *economic struggle* of the workers, in defence of the interests of the unemployed, in carrying out mass *political activity*, in the organization of joint *self-defence* against fascist attack; action agreed upon to render *aid to political prisoners and their families*, in the field of struggle against social reaction; joint action in defence of the *interests of the youth and women*, in the sphere of the *co-operative movement, cultural activity and sport*, joint action for the purpose of supporting the demands of the toiling peasants, etc.; the formation of workers' and peasants' alliances (Spain); the formation of lasting coalitions in the shape of "Labour Parties" or "Workers' and Farmers' Parties." (U. S. A.)

In order to develop the united front movement as the cause of the masses themselves, Communists must strive to secure the establishment of elected (or, in the countries under fascist dictatorship, selected from the most authoritative participants in the movement) *non-Party class organs of the united front* in the factories, among the unemployed, in the working-class districts, among the small townfolk, and in villages. Only such bodies, which of course, should not supplant the organisations participating in the united front, will be able to bring into the united front movement also the vast *unorganized mass* of toilers, will be able to assist in developing the initiative of the

masses in the struggle against the offensive of capital and against fascism, and on this basis help to create a large body of working-class united front activists.

4. Wherever the Social-Democratic leaders, in their efforts to deflect the workers from the struggle in defence of their every-day interests and in order to frustrate the united front, put forward *widely advertised "Socialist" projects* (the de Man plan, etc.), the demagogic nature of such projects must be exposed, and the toilers must be shown the impossibility of bringing about socialism so long as power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie. At the same time, however, some of the measures put forward in these projects that can be linked up with the vital demands of the toilers should be utilized *as the starting point for developing a mass united front struggle jointly with the Social-Democratic workers.*

In countries where *Social-Democratic governments* are in power (or where there are coalition governments in which Socialists participate), Communists must not confine themselves to propaganda exposing the policies of such Governments, but must mobilize the broad masses for the struggle to secure their practical vital class demands, the fulfilment of which the Social-Democrats announced in their platforms, particularly when they were not yet in power or were not yet members of their respective Governments.

5. Joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations not only does not preclude, but on the contrary, *renders still more necessary* the serious and well-founded criticism of reformism, of Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and the patient exposition of the principles and programme of Communism to the Social-Democratic workers.

While revealing to the masses the meaning of the demagogic argument, advanced by the Right Social-Democratic leaders against the united front, *while intensifying the struggle against the reactionary section of Social-Democracy*, the Communists must establish *the closest co-operation with those Left Social-Democratic workers, functionaries and organizations, that fight against the reformist policy and advocate a united front with the Communist Party.* The more we intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of Social Democracy, which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie, the more effective will be the assistance we give to that part of Social-Democracy which is becoming revolutionized and the self-deter-

mination of the various elements within the Left camp will take place the sooner, the more resolutely the Communists fight for a united front with the Social-Democratic Parties.

The attitude of the practical realization of the united front will be the chief indication of the true position of the various groups among the Social-Democrats. In the fight for the practical realization of the united front, those Social-Democratic leaders who come forward as Lefts in word will be obliged to show by deed whether they are really ready to fight the bourgeoisie and the Right Social-Democrats, or are on the side of the bourgeoisie, that is, against the cause of the working class.

6. *Election campaigns* must be utilized for the further development and strengthening of the united fighting front of the proletariat. While coming forward independently in the elections and unfolding the programme of the Communist Party before the masses, the Communists must seek to establish a united front with the Social-Democratic Parties and the trade unions (also with the organizations of the toiling peasants, handicraftsmen etc.) and exert every effort to prevent the election of reactionary and fascist candidates. In face of fascist danger, the Communists may, *while reserving for themselves freedom of political agitation and criticism*, participate in election campaigns on a common platform and with a common ticket of the anti-fascist front, depending on the growth and success of the united front movement, also depending on the electoral system in operation.

7. In striving to unite, under the leadership of the proletariat, the struggle of the toiling peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities, the Communists must seek to bring about the establishment of a wide *anti-fascist people's front* on the basis of the proletarian united front, supporting all those specific demands of those sections of the toilers which are in line with the fundamental interests of the proletariat. It is particularly important to mobilize the *toiling peasants* against the fascist policy of robbing the basic masses of the peasantry ; against the plundering price policy of monopoly capital and the bourgeois governments, against the unbearable burden of taxes, rents and debts, against forced sales of peasant property, and in favour of government aid for the ruined peasantry. While working everywhere among the *urban petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia* as well as among the *office employees*, the Commun-

ists must rouse these strata against increasing taxation and the high cost of living, against their spoliation by monopoly capital, by the trusts, against the thralldom of interest payments, and against dismissals and reductions in salary of government and municipal employees. While defending the interests and rights of the progressive intellectuals, it is necessary to give them every support in their movement against cultural reaction and to facilitate their going over to the side of the working class in the struggle against fascism.

8. In the circumstances of a political crisis, when the ruling classes are no longer in a position to cope with the powerful sweep of the mass movement, the Communists must advance *fundamental* revolutionary slogans (such as, for instance, control of production and the banks, disbandment of the police force and its replacement by an armed workers' militia, etc.) which are directed toward still further shaking the economic and political power of the bourgeoisie and increasing the strength of the working class, toward isolating the parties of compromise, and which lead the working masses right up to the point of the revolutionary seizure of power. If with such an upsurge of the mass movement it will prove possible, and necessary, in the interests of the proletariat, to create a *proletarian united front government* or an *anti-fascist people's front government* which is not yet a government of the proletarian dictatorship, but one which undertakes to put into effect decisive measures against fascism and reaction, the Communist Party must see to it that such a Government is formed. The following situation is an essential prerequisite for the formation of a united front government: (a) When the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie is seriously paralyzed so that the bourgeoisie is not in a condition to prevent the formation of such a government; (b) when vast masses of the toilers are vehemently in action against fascism and reaction, but are not yet ready to rise and fight for Soviet Power; (c) when already a considerable proportion of the organizations of the Social-Democratic and other parties participating in the united front demand ruthless measures against the fascists and other reactionaries, and are ready to fight together with the Communists for the carrying out of these measures.

In so far as the united front government will really undertake decisive measures against the counter-revolutionary financial magnates and their fascist agents, and will in no way restrict the activity of the Communist Party and the struggle

of the working class, the Communist Party will support such a government in every way. The participation of the Communists in a united front government will be decided separately in each particular case as the concrete situation may warrant.

III. THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Emphasizing the special importance of forming a united front in the sphere of the economic struggle of the workers and the establishment of the unity of the trade union movement as the most important step in consolidating the united front of the proletariat, the Congress makes it a duty of the Communists to adopt all practical measures for the realization of the unity of the trade unions by industries and on a national scale.

The Communists are decidedly for the re-establishment of trade union unity in each country and on an international scale; for united class trade unions as one of the major bulwarks of the working class against the offensive of capital and fascism; for one trade union in each industry; for one federation for trade union in each country; for one international federation to trade unions organized according to industries; for one international of trade unions based on the class struggle.

In countries where there are small Red trade unions, efforts must be made to secure their admission into the big reformist trade unions, with demands put forward for the right to defend their views and the reinstatement of expelled members. In countries where big red and reformist trade unions exist side by side, efforts must be made to secure their amalgamation on an equal footing, on the basis of a platform of struggle against the offensive of capital and a guarantee of trade union democracy.

It is the duty of Communists to work actively in the reformist and united trade unions, to consolidate them and to recruit the unorganized workers for them, and at the same time exert every effort to have these organizations actually defend the interests of the workers and really become genuine class organizations. To this end the Communists must strive to secure the support of the entire membership, of the officials, and of the organizations as a whole.

It is the duty of the Communists to defend the trade unions against all attempts on the part of the bourgeoisie and the fascists to restrict their rights or to destroy them.

If the reformist leaders resort to the policy of expelling

revolutionary workers or entire branches from the trade unions, or adopt other forms of repression, the Communists must rally the entire union membership against the splitting activity of the leadership, at the same time establishing contact between the expelled members and the bulk of the members of the trade unions, and engaging in a joint struggle for their reinstatement, for the restoration of the disrupted trade union unity.

The red trade unions and the Red International of Labour Unions must receive the fullest support of the Communist Parties in their efforts to bring about the joint struggle of the trade unions of all trends, and establish unity in the trade union movement both nationally and internationally, *on the basis of the class struggle and trade union democracy.*

IV. THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS IN THE INDIVIDUAL SECTORS OF THE ANTI-FASCIST MOVEMENT

1. The Congress calls particular attention to the necessity of carrying on a systematic *ideological struggle against fascism*. In view of the fact that the chief, the most dangerous form of fascist ideology is *chauvinism*, it must be made plain to the masses that the fascist bourgeoisie uses the pretext of defending the national interests to carry out its sordid class policy of oppressing and exploiting its own people as well as robbing and enslaving other peoples. They must be shown that the working class, which fights against every form of servitude and national oppression, is *the only genuine protagonist of national freedom and the independence of the people*. The Communists must in every way combat the fascist falsification of the history of the people, and do everything to enlighten the toiling masses on the past of their own people in historically correct fashion, in the true spirit of Lenin and Stalin, so as to link up their present struggle with the revolutionary traditions of the past. The Congress warns against adopting a disparaging attitude on the question of national independence and the national sentiments of the broad masses of the people, an attitude which renders it easier for fascism to develop its chauvinist campaign (the Saar, the German regions in Czechoslovakia, etc.) and insists on a correct and concrete application of the Leninist-Stalinist policy.

While Communists are irreconcilable opponents, on principle, of bourgeois nationalism of every variety, they are by

no means supporters of national nihilism, of an attitude of unconcern for the fate of their own people.

2. Communists must enter all *fascist mass organizations* which have a monopoly of legal existence in the given country, and must make use of even the smallest legal or semi-legal opportunity of working in them, in order to counterpose the interests of the masses in these organizations to the policy of fascism, and to undermine the mass basis of the latter. Beginning with the most elementary movements of protest around the urgent needs of toilers, the Communists must use flexible tactics to draw ever-wider masses into the movement, especially workers who by reason of their lack of class consciousness still follow the fascists. As the movement gains in width and depth, the slogans of the struggle must be changed while preparing to smash the fascist bourgeois dictatorship with the aid of the very masses who are in the fascist organisations.

3. While vigorously and consistently defending the interests and demands of the unemployed, while organizing and leading them in the fight for work, for adequate relief, insurance, etc., the Communists must draw the unemployed into the united front movement and use all means to force out the influence of fascism among them. At the same time it is necessary to take strictly into account the specific interests of the various categories of unemployed (skilled and unskilled workers, organized and unorganised, men and women, youth etc.)

4. The Congress emphatically calls the attention of all Communist Parties of the capitalist countries to the exceptional role of the youth in the struggle against fascism. It is from among the youth mainly that fascism recruits its shock detachments. In fighting against any underestimation of the importance of *mass work among the toiling youth*, and taking effective steps to overcome the secludedness of the Young Communist League organizations, the Communist Parties must do everything to help unite the forces of all non-fascist mass youth organizations, including youth organizations of the trade unions, co-operative societies, etc., on the basis of the broadest united front, including the formation of various kinds of common organizations for the struggle against fascism, against the unprecedented manner in which the youth is being stripped of every right, against the militarization of the youth and for the economic and cultural interests of the young generation. The task of creating an anti-fascist association of Communist and

Socialist Youth Leagues on the platform of the class struggle must be brought to the fore.

The Communist Parties must give every assistance in the development and consolidation of the Young Communist League.

5. The vital necessity of drawing the millions of toiling *women* into the united people's front, primarily women workers and toiling peasant women, irrespective of the political and religious view they hold, requires that the Communists intensify their activity for the purpose of developing the mass movement of the toiling women around the struggle for their urgent demands and interests, particularly in the struggle against the high cost of living, against inequality in the status of women and their fascist enslavement, against mass dismissals, for higher wages on the principle of "equal pay for equal work" and against the war danger. Flexible use must be made, in every country and on an international scale, of the most varied organisational forms to establish contacts between and bring about joint action of the revolutionary, Social-Democratic and progressive women's organisations, while ensuring freedom of opinion and criticism, without hesitating to form also separate women's organisations wherever this may become necessary.

6. Communists must carry on a struggle to draw the co-operative organisations into the ranks of the united front of the proletariat and of the anti-fascist people's front.

The most active assistance must be rendered by Communists in the struggle of the co-operative societies for the urgent interests of their members, especially in the fight against high prices, for credits, against the introduction of predatory duties and new taxes, against the restrictions imposed on the activities of the co-operative societies and their destruction by the fascists, etc.

7. The Communists must take the initiative in establishing *anti-fascist mass defence corps* against the attacks of the fascist bands, recruiting these corps from reliable, tested elements of the united front movement.

V. THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE COLONIAL COUNTRIES

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the most important task facing the Communists consists in working to establish an *anti-imperialist people's front*. For this purpose it is necessary to draw the widest masses into the national liberation movement against growing imperialist exploitation, against cruel enslavement, for the driving out of the imperialists, for the independence of the country; to take an active part in the mass anti-imperialist movements headed by the national reformists and strive to bring about joint action with the national-revolutionary and national-reformist organisations on the basis of a definite anti-imperialist platform.

In China, the extension of the Soviet movement and the strengthening of the fighting power of the Red Army must be combined with the development of the people's anti-imperialist movement all over the country. This movement must be carried on under the slogan of the national-revolutionary struggle of the armed people against the imperialist enslavers, in the first place against Japanese imperialism and its Chinese servitors. The Soviets must become the rallying centre for the entire Chinese people in its struggle for emancipation.

In the interests of its own struggle for emancipation, the proletariat of the imperialist countries must give its unstinted support to the liberation struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples against the imperialist pirates.

VI. THE STRENGTHENING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE POLITICAL UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

The Congress emphasises with particular stress that only *the further all-round consolidation of the Communist Parties themselves*, the development of their initiative, the carrying out of a policy based on Marxist-Leninist principles; and the application of correct flexible tactics, which take into account the concrete situation and the alignment of class forces, can ensure the mobilisation of the widest masses of toilers for the united struggle against fascism, against capitalism.

In order that the united front may be really brought about, the Communists must overcome the self-satisfied *sectarianism* in their own ranks which in our day is, in a number of

cases, no longer an "infantile disorder" of the Communist movement but an ingrained vice. By overestimating the degree of revolutionization of the masses, by creating the illusion that the path to fascism had already been barred while the fascist movement was continuing to grow, this sectarianism actually fostered passivity in relation to fascism. In practice it replaced the methods of leading the masses by the methods of leading a narrow party group, substituted abstract propaganda and Left doctrinairism for a mass policy, refusing to work in the reformist trade unions and fascist mass organizations and adopting stereotyped tactics and slogans for all countries without taking account of the special features of the concrete situation in each particular country. This sectarianism to a great extent retarded the growth of the Communist Parties, made it difficult for a genuine mass policy to be carried out and hindered these Parties in making use of the difficulties of the class enemy to strengthen the revolutionary movement, hindered the cause of winning over the wide masses of the proletariat to the side of the Communist Parties.

While carrying on a most energetic struggle to root out all vestiges of sectarianism, which at the present moment is a most serious obstacle to the pursuing of a real mass Bolshevik policy by the Communist Parties, the Communists must increase their vigilance in guarding against the danger of *right opportunism*, and must carry on a determined struggle against all its concrete manifestations, bearing in mind that the *Right danger will grow* as the tactics of the united front are widely applied. The struggle for the establishment of the united front, the unity of action of the working class, gives rise to the necessity that the Social-Democratic workers be convinced by object lessons of the correctness of the Communist policy and the incorrectness of the reformist policy, and charges every Communist Party to wage an irreconcilable struggle against any tendency to gloss over the differences in principles between Communism and reformism, against weakening the criticism of Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, against the illusion that it is possible to bring about socialism by peaceful, legal methods, against any reliance on *automatism* or *spontaneity*, whether in the liquidation of fascism or in the realization of the united front, against belittling the role of the Party and against the slightest *vacillation at the moment of decisive action*.

Holding that the interests of the class struggle of the

proletariat and the success of the proletarian revolution make it imperative that *a single mass political Party of the working class* exists in every country, the Congress sets the Communist Parties the task of taking the initiative in bringing about this unity, relying on the growing desire of the workers to unite the Social-Democratic parties or individual organisations with the Communist Parties. At the same time it must be explained to the workers without fail that such unity is possible only under certain conditions ; under the conditions of *complete independence from the bourgeoisie and the complete severance of the bloc between social-democracy and the bourgeoisie*, under the condition that *unity of action* be first brought about, that the necessity of the *revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets* be recognized, that support of one's own bourgeoisie in the *imperialist war* be rejected, and that the party be constructed on the basis of *democratic centralism* which ensures unity of will and action and has been tested by the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks.

At the same time it is necessary to act resolutely against the attempt of the "Left" Social-Democratic demagogues to utilize the disillusionment among the Social-Democratic workers to form new Socialist Parties and a new "International" which are directed against the Communist movement and thus widen the split in the working class.

Considering that unity of action is an urgent necessity and the surest way to bring about the political unity of the proletariat, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International declares in the name of all Sections of the Communist International that they are ready to begin immediate negotiations with corresponding parties of the Second International for the establishment of unity of action of the working class against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialist war, and likewise declares that *the Communist International is prepared to enter into negotiations with the Second International directed to this end.*

VII. FOR SOVIET POWER

In the struggle to defend against fascism the bourgeois democratic liberties and the gains of the toilers, in the struggle to overthrow fascist dictatorship, the revolutionary proletariat prepares its forces, strengthens its fighting contacts with its allies and directs the struggle toward the goal of achieving real democracy of the toilers—Soviet Power.

The further consolidation of the Land of the Soviets, the rallying of the world proletariat around it, and the mighty growth of the international authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the turn toward revolutionary class struggle which has set in among the Social-Democratic workers and the workers organized in the reformist trade unions, the increasing mass resistance to fascism and the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, the decline of the Second International and the growth of the Communist International are all accelerating and will continue to accelerate the development of the world socialist revolution.

The capitalist world is entering a period of sharp clashes as a result of the accentuation of the internal and external contradictions of capitalism.

Steering a course in the direction of this perspective of the revolutionary development, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International calls on the Communist Parties to display the greatest political activity and daring, to carry on a tireless struggle to bring about unity of action by the working class. *The establishment of the united front of the working class is the decisive link in the preparation of the toilers for the forthcoming great battles of the second round of proletarian revolution.* Only the welding of the proletariat into a single mass political army will ensure its victory in the struggle against fascism and the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of the Soviets.

"The victory of revolution never comes by itself. It has to be prepared for and won. And only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare for and win victory." (Stalin).

III. THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

*(Resolution on the Report of D. Z. Manuilsky, Adopted
August 20, 1935 by the Seventh Congress of the
Communist International)*

HAVING heard Comrade Manuilsky's report on *The Results of Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R.*, the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International notes with profound satisfaction, that under the leadership of the C.P.S.U., the final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the all-round consolidation of the State of the proletarian dictatorship have been achieved as a result of carrying through the socialist reconstruction of national economy, of accomplishing the collectivization of agriculture, of squeezing out the capitalist elements and liquidating the kulaks as a class.

1. *Socialist industrialization has been successfully carried through.* The U.S.S.R. has changed from an economically and technically backward agrarian country into a great, advanced, industrial country with its iron and steel production, machinery construction, aviation, automobile and tractor industry, and is becoming a country of electric power and chemical industries. The U.S.S.R. is in a position to manufacture any machine and any instrument of production in its plants. Big industrial towns have sprung up in formerly uninhabited places. The old industrial areas are expanding and new ones are being created. The formerly backward outlying regions and the erstwhile tsarist colonies are being successfully industrialized and, as a result, are being transformed into flourishing, advanced industrial national republics and territories. Highly qualified cadres of technicians, organizers and executives have been trained for the numerous and diversified industries and processes of production. The successes already achieved provide new great possibilities for the further growth of the industrialization of the entire national economy of the U.S.S.R.

2. *The greatest revolution has been successfully accomplished in the countryside—the collectivization of agriculture.* With the triumph of the collective farm system, the most difficult task, that of turning the vast majority of the pea-

santry on to the path of socialist development, has been solved in practice. Largescale mechanized agriculture, organized along socialist lines, has been established. The network of machine and tractor stations is extending. The Soviet (state) farms are gaining strength. The material and productive advantages of the collective farm system have already become a stimulus to the further consolidation of the collective farms and extension of voluntary collectivization. The grain problem has been solved. Livestock raising has improved and is steadily on the upgrade. Thanks to the collective and state farms, the existence of vast stretches of hitherto uncultivated fertile soil and the turn to intensive methods of agriculture, accompanied by an ever-increasing application of technique and scientific principles of farming, guarantee the possibility of the development of socialist agriculture in the U.S.S.R. on a tremendous scale.

3. *A radical improvement in the material conditions of the toilers in the U.S.S.R. and a tremendous rise of their cultural level have been achieved.* Unemployment has disappeared. Workers and office employees are growing in number and becoming more highly skilled. Wage and social insurance funds as well as individual wages and social insurance benefits are rising (sanatoriums, rest homes, free medical aid, invalid and old-age pensions, etc.). The working day has been reduced to seven and six hours, and the conditions of labour are progressively improving. Food supply difficulties are being successfully overcome (abolition of bread cards; the growing supply of meat and fats for the toilers, as livestock raising keeps on developing). The big cities and industrial centres have changed their appearance. The housing and living conditions of the toilers are steadily improving; in place of the slums which are characteristic of the working class quarters in big cities and industrial centres under capitalism, spacious, light and sanitary workers' homes have already been built and more are being built. Thanks to the collectivization of agriculture and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, poverty has vanished in the villages, the peasants have secured the opportunity of a well-to-do life, and work under conditions which do not exhaust but invigorate them.

Solicitude for people, for the toilers, for the cadres and, above all, solicitude for the children, occupies a central place in the activities of the Party, the State, the Trade Unions and all public organizations. The cultural level of the toilers is

rising fast. In all the Republics of the Soviet Union universal compulsory elementary education has been introduced, conducted in the native national languages. Millions of children of the workers, peasants and office employees are studying in the secondary schools and universities. A vast network of educational institutions for children under school age, and a system of specialized evening schools, circles and courses for adults have been set up. Tens of thousands of clubs, theatres and cinema houses have been built in working class districts, at factories, in villages. The development and flourishing of the culture, national in form and socialist in content, of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. which were formerly oppressed, neglected and doomed to extinction, but are now free and equal, proceeds apace. Women actively participate in socialist construction on an equal footing with men. Young generations which have grown up under Soviet conditions, which have not known capitalist exploitation or want and deprivation of rights, and recognize only the interests, tasks and aims of socialism, are entering into the construction of socialism. Science and all forms of art have been made accessible to the broadest masses. Academicians, scientists, research workers, actors, writers, painters and masters of every other branch of art have turned to the side of the toilers. No matter how vast all these material and cultural achievements may be, compared with the recent past and with the position of the toilers in capitalist countries today, they represent merely the beginning of that splendid near future, flourishing in every way and abounding in universal well-being, toward which the Land of Socialism is advancing.

4. *A great political consolidation of the state of the proletarian dictatorship has been achieved.* The Land of the Soviets has the most stable and most impregnable political order. It is a state of developed democracy, not divorced from the masses of the people nor placed in opposition to them, but organically connected with them, defending their interests, expressing their will and carrying it into effect. The profound, radical changes which have taken place in the social structure of the U.S.S.R. as a result of the socialist reconstruction of national economy, the elimination of the exploiting classes and the victory of the collective farm system, have brought about a further expansion and strengthening of the social foundation of the Soviet Power. In accordance with these changes and relying on the increased confidence of the

broad masses in the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet government has carried out new measures of great historic significance in introducing a further democratization of its system: the substitution of equal suffrage for the previously not entirely equal suffrage, direct for indirect elections, the secret for the open ballot; the extension of electoral rights to include new sections of the adult population, re-enfranchisement of those of the former kulaks who have been deprived of the vote but who have since shown in actual fact, by honest labour, that they have ceased to fight against the Soviet order. The dictatorship of the proletariat is steadily developing along the path of constantly strengthening and widening the direct connection of the Soviet State with the masses of the people, with the overwhelming majority of the population, the path of enhancing the all-round and active direct participation of the masses of the people in the administration of the state and the direction of socialist construction. The development of proletarian democracy which has been attained as a consequence of the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the consolidation of socialist ownership as the basis of Soviet society and the realization of the unity of interests of the vast majority of the population in all the Republics of the Soviet Union, enormously strengthens the State of the proletarian dictatorship.

True to its principle of the brotherhood, freedom and independence of all peoples and nations, the Soviet Union unswervingly fights for the preservation of peace between nations, exposes the aggressive plans of the imperialist robbers and takes all the necessary steps to secure the defence of the socialist fatherland of the toilers of the whole world against the menace of a predatory attack by the imperialists. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International records with satisfaction that in place of old tsarist Russia, a country beaten by all, and in place of the weak Soviet country which, in the early days of its development, was faced with the possibility of being partitioned by the imperialists, a mighty socialist state has now arisen.

The U.S.S.R. is becoming a country of the new man, of a new social and individual mode of life of people. In the great workshop of planned socialist labour, founded on socialist competition, on shock work and the creative initiative of the masses, a process of remaking people is taking place. The mercenary and anti-social, private property ethics and habits

inherited from capitalism are gradually vanishing. The atmosphere of enthusiastic socialist labour facilitates the re-education of criminals and law-breakers. The principle of the inviolability of public property is being instilled in every branch of national economy in town and village. The public opinion of the toiling masses and the practice of self-criticism have become a mighty factor for moral influence for bringing up people and re-educating them. On the basis of the new attitude towards labour and society that is gaining firm hold, a new mode of life is being created, the consciousness and psychology of people are becoming reshaped, new generations, healthy, able-bodied, and versatilely developed, are coming into being. From the very midst of the people, organisers, leaders, inventors, bold explorers of the uncharted elements of the Arctic, heroic conquerors of the atmosphere, the air and the depths of the sea, of the summits of mountains and the bowels of the earth, are coming forth in vast numbers. Millions of toilers are storming and mastering the hitherto inaccessible citadels of technique, science and art. The U.S.S.R. is becoming a country of new people, full of purpose, buoyancy and the joy of living, surmounting all difficulties and performing great feats.

5. *The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. was achieved in a determined struggle by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against "right" and "left" opportunism, in a stubborn and protracted struggle to overcome enormous difficulties, which arose because of the low level of technical and economic development inherited by the country and because of the need to achieve, in a brief space of time, by its own forces and means, and under conditions of hostile encirclement by imperialists, the reconstruction of the technical foundation of national economy and the fundamental reorganization of its social and economic relations. Carrying out his readjustment, and especially the rebuilding of the technical base of agriculture, which was connected with the uniting of small peasant households into large collective farms and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, meant a resolute attack by the proletariat on the capitalist elements. As they lost every economic foundation, the remnants of the exploiting classes, backed by the imperialists, offered desperate resistance, resorted to sabotage, wrecking, the burning of crops, the disruption of sowing campaigns, the extermination of cattle, etc. The proletariat succeeded in crushing the resistance of its*

enemies, creating a powerful socialist industry, consolidating the collective farm, surmounting the difficulties connected with the need for rapid advancement of national economy. *The possibility of building up socialism in a single country, brilliantly foreseen by Lenin and Stalin, has become a reality, palpable and tangible, for millions of people throughout the world. The historic question of "who will win" inside the country, the question of the victory of socialism over capitalism in the U.S.S.R. has been finally and irrevocably decided in favour of socialism.* This does not exclude the possibility that the survivors of the routed class enemy, who have lost all hopes of preventing the development of socialism, will do whatever harm they can to the workers and collective farmers of the U.S.S.R.

The further development of triumphant socialism will be accompanied in the U.S.S.R. by difficulties of a different order, difficulties arising out of the need to overcome the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people. With the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. the world proletarian revolution has gained an impregnable position in the sharpening struggle to decide the question "who will win" on the international arena.

6. *The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is a victory of world importance gained, with the support of the international proletariat, by the workers and collective farmers of the U.S.S.R., under the leadership of the best companion-in-arms of the great Lenin, the wise leader of the toilers of the whole world, Comrade Stalin, the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is causing a profound change in the minds of the toilers of the whole world; it is convincing the broad masses of Social-Democratic workers and workers of other trends of the necessity of waging a common struggle for socialism, and is a decisive factor in the realisation of proletarian fighting unity; it is destroying ideas and conceptions, embedded for centuries, of the capitalist order being eternal and unshakable, is revealing the bankruptcy of bourgeois theories and the schemes to "rejuvenate" capitalist society, is having a revolutionizing effect on the toiling masses, instilling into them confidence in their own strength and a conviction of the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism. The road to salvation, the road to socialism already trodden by the living example of the U.S.S.R. is shining brightly before the eyes of millions of toilers in the capitalist and colonial countries, of all the exploited and oppressed.*

The Soviet socialist order guarantees :

To the workers—liberation from the horrors of unemployment and capitalist exploitation, the opportunity to work for themselves and not for exploiters and parasites ; to administer the state and national economy, to steadily improve their material conditions, to lead a cultured life.

To the peasants—land and emancipation from their bondage to landlords, moneylenders, from unbearable taxes, liberation from crises, ruin, degradation and destitution, a steady rise in their prosperity and cultural standards, and thoroughgoing lightening of their labour.

To the petty-bourgeois folk of the towns—liberation from the nightmare of bankruptcy, from the oppression of big capital, from ruin and degeneration, and the opportunity of finding a place as honest toilers in the system of socialist economy, of bringing about a radical improvement in their material and spiritual life.

To the intellectuals—the necessary conditions and the widest scope for the perfection of their knowledge, capabilities and talents, great impulses and wide horizons for creative work, a radical improvement in their material and cultural life.

To peoples of the colonies and dependencies—national emancipation from the yoke of the imperialists, the possibility of rapidly raising their national economy to the level of the most advanced countries, the advancement and flourishing of their national culture, free and equal active participation in international life.

7. *With the victory of socialism, the U.S.S.R. has become a great political, economic and cultural force which influences world policy. It has become the centre of attraction and the rallying point for all peoples, countries and even governments which are interested in the preservation of international peace. It has become the stronghold of the toilers of all countries against the menace of war. It has become a mighty weapon for consolidating the toilers of the whole world against world reaction.*

From the historic balance of achievements secured since the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, with which the world proletarian movement is approaching the second round of wars and revolutions and which determines the basic tasks of the world proletarian revolution, follows the primary

duty of the working class and the toilers of the world and of all Sections of the C. I. :

To help with all their might and by all means to strengthen the U.S.S.R. and to fight against the enemies of the U.S.S.R. both under peace conditions and in the circumstances of war directed against the U.S.S.R. the interests of strengthening the U.S.S.R., of increasing its power, of ensuring its victory in all spheres and in every sector of the struggle, coincide fully and inseparably with the interests of the toilers of the whole world in their struggle against the exploiters, with the interests of the colonial and oppressed peoples fighting against imperialism ; they are the conditions for, and they contribute to, the triumph of the world proletarian revolution, the victory of socialism throughout the world. Assistance to the U.S.S.R., its defence, and co-operation in bringing about its victory over all its enemies must therefore determine the actions of every revolutionary, of every socialist, communist, non-party worker, toiling peasant, of every honest intellectual and democrat, of each and every one who desires the overthrow of exploitation, fascism and imperialist oppression, deliverance from imperialist war, who desires that there should exist brotherhood and peace among nations, that socialism should triumph throughout the world.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

(Report delivered to the Seventh Congress of the Communist
International, August 13, 1935.)

INTRODUCTION

COMRADES, the problems of war and the struggle against war have always been in the forefront of the attention of the Communist International and the work of our Parties. "*Remember the imperialist war*" declares the first appeal which our International issued to the toilers of the whole world. This call for a struggle against war was again stressed by our Fifth World Congress and was renewed with special intensity in 1927 and the following years, at the time when all the objective conditions for the outbreak of a new imperialist war had matured and the capitalist world was beginning to slide into a new world war. Since that time we have regarded the danger of a new war as an *imminent* danger, we have appealed to the proletariat and the wide masses of toilers to fight against this danger and we have given all possible support to any mass movement which has developed on the basis of a genuine struggle against imperialist war.

As in all other spheres, the outlook determined on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the mutual relations in the capitalist world has been confirmed by the course of events. And today who would dare to doubt that if the outbreak of war has been delayed, if it has been possible to avoid the attack on the Soviet Union which was being prepared for 1930-31 by some big imperialist powers (not without the benevolent aid of some of the leaders of international Social-Democracy), this has been due also to the fact that we sounded the alarm and that a considerable section of the working class heard our appeal and responded to it.

In 1928, our Sixth World Congress worked out our general

line for the struggle against war. This line, which has already passed through its ordeal by fire, remains our basic line. But profound changes have taken place in the international situation since the Sixth World Congress, especially during the last few years. A new repartition of the world by means of armed force has begun in the Far East. The mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world have entered into a new phase as the result of the victory which socialism has attained here, in the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

New possibilities have opened up for the peace policy of the Soviet Union. The connection between the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the struggle of the workers, and of the toilers in general, for peace, is demonstrated more plainly than it ever was before. At the same time, fascism has conquered in Germany and in a number of other countries and the war danger has become so much intensified that it demands the greatest efforts on the part of the Communist vanguard and of the working class to bring together all the forces which can be mobilized for the struggle against the instigators of war and for the defense of peace and of the Soviet Union. Hence the demand arises that we should make some changes in our tactics in this field as well, taking into account the alterations which have arisen in the situation and in the relation of forces.

Comrade Lenin repeatedly warned us by persistently drawing our attention and the attention of all workers to the difficulties of the struggle against war. There is no such thing as "war in general," but there are concrete wars, the nature of which follows from the nature of the historical period in which they take place and the class relations obtaining in the world as a whole and in the warring countries in particular. This is why I consider that the task of our Congress, in its study of the problems of war and of struggle against war, is not to repeat what was said and done by the Sixth World Congress, but to examine and analyze with the greatest care all the new factors which have now arisen in the international situation and in the relations between classes and states, and which have an influence in fixing the character of the war which threatens us, and to draw from this analysis all the conclusions necessary for determining our tasks and establishing the prospects before us.

II. THE UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN THE YEARS OF CRISIS

THE END OF THE VERSAILLES AND WASHINGTON SYSTEMS

THERE has never been and there cannot be stability in the relations between the big capitalist powers. It is rendered impossible owing to the law of the uneven development of capitalism.

Comrade Stalin in his concluding speech to the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. gave a full description of the way in which this law of the uneven development of capitalism manifests itself :

"...For the very reason that the backward countries are accelerating their development and are attaining the level of the advanced countries, for this very reason the struggle becomes sharper for the supremacy of some countries over others, for this very reason the *possibility arises* for some countries to surpass others and to drive them from the markets, thereby creating the preconditions for armed conflicts, for weakening the world front of capitalism, for the rupture of this front by the proletarians in various capitalist countries."

The period of the world economic crisis and the depression of a special kind give us a special example of uneven development of capitalism in all spheres.

The leading imperialist powers which emerged victoriously from the World War boasted that by the Versailles and Washington Treaties they had created lasting stability in international relations, and permanent order both on a European and world scale. Nothing of the kind happened.

The Versailles Treaty was based on the following points :

1. The maintenance of the defeated countries, especially Germany, in a state of political inferiority, and their spoliation by the victor states.

2. An agreement between the victor states for dividing the spoils of war, for fixing the frontiers of Europe and for the distribution of colonies and colonial mandates in such a way as to establish their hegemony throughout the world.

3. The preparation of economic blockade and armed counter-revolutionary intervention against the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

For its part, the Washington Treaty established the relations of forces between the big naval powers, especially in the Pacific Ocean, the treaty considering the huge territory of

China as an immediate field of expansion of the big imperialist brigands and seeking to regulate their desperate competition and struggle in connection with the conquest and plunder of Chinese territory.

From the outset it was found that it was impossible to realize a large part of the clauses of these treaties. The plans for encircling and attacking the Russian Soviet Republic were shattered by the heroic struggle of the Soviet workers and peasants and by the victory which they gained in the Civil War, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin and with the active support of the international proletariat.

It is important to note, however, that the contradictions also intensified between the victor powers themselves that had imposed the post-war treaties; they were in mutual rivalry, and this rivalry was bound ultimately to smash up the whole system established by these post-war treaties.

When the crisis took place, the unevenness of the development of capitalism became still further accentuated. There were sharp breaks and jumps. The countries which had experienced the most rapid rise and the greatest prosperity were the first to be thrown into the crisis and experienced its consequences most severely. In other countries, as was the case in France last year, the level of production fell just when the greater part of the capitalist world was already registering a rise. This creates new political instability and gives the development of international relations a feverish character which becomes accentuated year by year during the crisis.

Inside each country, the results of the crisis and the methods used by the ruling classes to find a way out of the crisis and to throw the cost of the crisis on the backs of the toilers are of such a character as to cause an increase in the aggressiveness of the imperialist bourgeoisie and an ever-greater tension in international relations. The enormous increase of unemployment, the reduction of wages, the impoverishment of the toiling peasantry, the lowering of the standard of living of all the toilers, with an extreme contraction of the home market in each country, give rise to an intensified struggle for foreign markets and sharpen competition on the world market to an extreme degree. On the other hand, the growth of the concentration of capital and monopolies (which in all countries is also speeded up by the crisis) helps to increase the imperialist aggressiveness of the bourgeoisie. In every country, the most reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie orientate them-

selves on war. These elements regard war as the best means, and, at a particular time, as the sole means, of overcoming the difficulties produced by the crisis. The following declaration, unprecedented in its frankness and cynicism, appeared some months ago in a Swedish magazine :

"War today is in no way different from what it was formerly. It will increase the demand for shipping, the risks of transport will grow, the prices of goods will also rise, speculation will grow stronger.... If on the contrary war does not come, the world will still have to wait for a long time for a natural improvement, because it is still far away."

This cynicism in which we read the irrevocable condemnation of a regime which puts its hopes in destruction, death and war, is thoroughly characteristic of the state of mind created among the bourgeoisie by the crisis.

In the sphere of international economic relations, the most characteristic fact of the crisis is the shrinkage of trade, which has not disappeared but on the contrary has become more pronounced in the years of depression. This shrinkage is to a great extent the result of the tariff barriers which each country has erected at its frontiers to protect its shrunken and exhausted home market. The crisis has finally buried the system of free trade. Each capitalist has now only one aim, that of selling at the highest possible price to the toilers of his own country who are impoverished by the crisis, and to guarantee himself an extra margin of profit by selling on foreign markets at the lowest possible price so as to defeat the competition of his rivals.

The plans for the organization of so-called autarchy of production are only a deceptive mask for the increased economic aggressiveness of the bourgeoisie in each country. Dumping is becoming the rule for all the big capitalist countries. This makes for a breach of all the existing commercial treaties, and the struggle for the conclusion of new treaties develops in an atmosphere of tension and of actual economic war. To avoid bankruptcy the small countries are compelled to submit to the conditions imposed on them by the stronger countries. The biggest capitalist states, Great Britain and the United States, were the first to resort to the devaluation of their currencies as a means of strengthening their position on the world market and beating their opponents. Currency chaos, only to be compared with that of the worst years immediately following the war, deprives international economic relations

of all stability, changes the traditional appearance of the markets, artificially creates new trends of commerce, destroys the most firmly established positions, brings about the most unexpected changes and reactions. Thus, a state of actual economic war, the preface and preparation for a war fought with armed forces, is being created throughout the world.

Allow me to dwell for a moment on the concrete example of the economic development of Japan, which is the most striking in this sphere. The rate at which Japan has achieved its commercial expansion during recent years has no precedent in the history of the commerce of capitalist countries. In the western part of the Pacific Ocean, Japan has particularly strengthened its economic positions. Japanese exports to these countries, which amounted to 367,000,000 yen in 1931, rose to 684,000,000 in 1933. During the same period, the exports of the U.S.A. to the same markets fell from 341,000,000 dollars to 262,000,000, and those of Great Britain from 30,000,000 pounds to 24,000,000. In the Dutch Indies, Japanese trade has defeated all competitors and has occupied the first place. The textile market in Indonesia was captured by the Japanese in record time. Japanese goods have rapidly penetrated into the markets of the Near East, driving out Great Britain, Italy and the other countries. In China, Japanese imports, which fell as a result of the boycott by the people during the period of revolutionary upsurge, have in the recent past begun to develop rapidly again owing to the support of the Nanking government. The increase of Japanese exports to Central and South America is particularly striking. The part played by the colonial and dependent countries in Japanese exports is larger than in the exports of any other country. Moreover, what is particularly important is that the proportion of exports taken by colonies belonging to other countries is greater in the case of Japan than for any other imperialist country. Thus, Japan has driven Great Britain from the position which she has so long occupied of being the biggest textile exporter in the whole world. By the penetration of its trade into the colonies and spheres of influence of other countries, Japan provokes the accentuation of the contradictions with all the other imperialist countries. The bourgeoisie of these countries have resorted to special measures to defend their markets and the markets of their colonies from Japanese goods. The Japanese bourgeoisie replies to these measures by increasing its dumping and contraband. In this way the transition to an open econo-

mic war is taking place.

This tremendous economic expansion of Japan appears before us in its true light only if we realize the class nature of Japanese dumping which is based on the miserable wages of the working men and women of Japan and on the unprecedented impoverishment of the mass of the Japanese peasantry. Japanese imperialist aggressiveness and the policy of war provocation pursued by the Japanese military clique objectively have their roots in a class policy based on the misery and starvation of the widest masses of the people in the country.

The drastic changes in the economic relations between the dominant imperialist countries under the blows of the crisis have, therefore, been the immediate cause of the undermining and destruction of the post-war treaties. Under the pressure of British imperialism which at a definite period was interested in the economic and political rise of Germany, France has become "convinced" of the necessity of refraining from the use of force to extort the billions of reparation payments from the German people. Nevertheless in 1931, at the height of the crisis, the former allies still considered it possible to demand from Germany the payment of the huge sum of 2,500,000,000 marks per year for a period of 62 years. It was the intervention of the United States, compelled thereto by the crisis, that resulted in the complete collapse of this part of the Versailles Treaty.

When the fascists came to power in Germany at the beginning of 1933, three-quarters of the Versailles system had already been reduced to nothing. The so-called unilateral acts which have resulted in its further liquidation were equally the result of a concealed but desperate struggle between the big imperialist powers. These acts include the refusal of the Hitler government to fulfill the obligations arising under the Young Plan, the re-establishment of compulsory military service for the entire German people and the creation of a new and powerful German army and a naval and air fleet.

At the present time all that is left of the Versailles system is the post-war European frontiers and the partition of the colonies and the colonial mandates. That is to say, nothing remains except that which can only be destroyed by open armed force, by means of violence and war. On the other hand, nothing at all is left of the Washington Treaty. The sections of this treaty, which fixed the relation of forces between the big naval powers, have been denounced and have given place

to a mad race in naval armaments. The armies of the Japanese imperialists which occupied Manchuria and North China without regard to protests from Geneva and from the pacifists, and which are now continuing their march towards the occupation of all Chinese territory, have crushed under foot the last traces of the Washington agreements.

Comrades, the Communist International and the Communist Parties of the various countries concerned have been in the forefront of the fight against the predatory post-war treaties. We have no tears to shed over the end of the hateful system of oppression and plunder which was established at Versailles. On May 13, 1919, in a manifesto to the toilers of the whole world, the Executive Committee of the Communist International, which had just been formed, denounced the Versailles peace as a predatory peace. We formulated this unreserved condemnation at a moment when the leaders of international Social-Democracy were affixing their signature to the Versailles Treaty and were praising it as a work of justice, as the beginning of a new era of international collaboration and "the organization of world peace."

We do not have to withdraw a single word of our condemnation of the Versailles Treaty. But at the present moment, when the collapse and end the Versailles Treaty is one of the chief elements characterizing the present situation, it is our duty to face squarely the *new situation* confronting the proletariat of the entire world and to determine our tasks and the tasks of the proletariat in the light of this new situation. This is still not understood by everyone, especially by certain groups of pacifists for whom the struggle against the Versailles Treaty becomes at times a pretext for closing their eyes to the aggressive policy and war provocation of German National-Socialism and for deflecting the attention of the toilers from the necessity of concentrating their efforts on the struggle against the chief instigators of a new imperialist war.

We Communists were the only ones who have consistently waged a struggle for the liquidation of the Versailles Treaty. But we always carried on this struggle as a struggle for the social and national demands of the masses and for revolution.

"Our struggle against the Versailles system," declared Comrade Thaelmann at the historic meeting in Paris on October 31, 1932, "has nothing in common with the imperialist demands and nationalist propaganda of the German bourgeoisie and the National-Socialists.... We want

to destroy both the national oppression established by the Versailles Treaty and the Social oppression of the toilers caused by the system of capitalist profit.... Our fight against the Versailles Treaty is a fight for wages and bread, a fight for liberty, a fight for socialism."

Comrades, we fought for the destruction of the post-war treaties along the path of social and national emancipation. That which has taken place has nothing in common with the aims for which we struggled. The post-war treaties were smashed to pieces by the desperate rivalries between the imperialists. The situation which has resulted from this is the eve of a new world war which German imperialism intends to wage in order to impose upon the peoples a "peace" after the fashion of the one demonstrated by the Prussian generals at Brest-Litovsk. It is this menace, which today is the most serious, that we take as our starting point in deciding our position in the struggle against imperialism and war.

The end of the Versailles and Washington systems signifies the bankruptcy of hypocritical bourgeois pacifism, it signifies that the instability in international relations has attained an extreme degree, it denotes the transition to the use of force for solving all acute questions, all existing conflicts in all parts of the world, it marks a turning point in the headlong armaments race. A new imperialist war for the redivision of the world is not only inevitable, is not only being prepared for in all its details by every imperialist power, but can break out and surprise us at any moment.

II. THE STRENGTH OF THE SOVIET UNION, THE JAPANESE PLANS OF AGGRESSION AND THE DRIVE OF FASCISM

COMRADES, the capitalist world is hurling itself into a new war. We set ourselves the task to determine concretely whence the war danger comes today, who are the present instigators of war, what kind of war it is that they want to kindle and are already preparing. To answer these questions we must concentrate our attention on three fundamental facts, as follows:

1. The powerful rise of the Soviet Union;
2. The attack of the Japanese military clique in the Far East;

3. The drive of fascism in Europe and especially in Germany.

THE POWERFUL RISE OF THE SOVIET UNION

The development of the forces of revolution has always been one of the factors with the greatest influence on international interrelations. But the present rise of the Soviet Union is a fact of a new order, and its historic importance is far in excess of anything known in the whole of previous history. It is a fact which is already breaking the framework of the old capitalist world, which overthrows all existing interrelations, and determines a new line of development of the whole international situation.

The Soviet Union, which has become stronger from all points of view, both internally and in its international relations, is the only constant, stable and solid force which can serve as the support for a policy of defending peace. Such a consolidation of the international position of the Soviet Union is the direct result of the strengthening of the position of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism in all spheres of the life of the country.

In 1918-20, the armies of intervention sent against the Land of the Soviets by the Entente Powers had on their side the forces of the Russian capitalists and landowners whom the October Revolution had driven from power. In some cases, the imperialist forces of the interventionists restricted themselves merely to enrolling and arming cadres and directing the attacks made on the young Soviet Republic by the reactionary classes which were not yet completely defeated. In 1930-32, the trial of the Industrial Party revealed that the imperialist powers, in organizing intervention against the Soviet Union, were relying on the support of a counter-revolutionary organization which embraced all the elements hostile to the dictatorship of the proletariat within the country.

The changes in the relation of forces which have taken place in the Soviet Union of recent years, and which are an expression of the final and irrevocable victory of socialism over capitalism, gave a final death blow to these criminal plans of attack against the Soviet Union. They have destroyed any possibility for the counter-revolutionary armies of intervention to count on receiving support within the U.S.S.R. from the classes hostile to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But this increased class homogeneity in the population of the Soviet Union is not the only element which we must take into consideration. The point is not merely the fact that, as against the capitalist countries, the proletarians and collective farmers of the Soviet Union constitute a compact mass of constructors of the new socialist society, determined to defend the victories of the revolution by all their means and at the cost of their lives. The technical equipment of the Soviet country, which is the result of the victorious completion of the First Five-Year Plan and the fulfilment of the first half of the Second Five-Year Plan, allows them to regard the prospect of an attack by the imperialist countries with full confidence in their own forces. It is sufficient to recall a few figures bearing on the development of heavy industry in the Soviet Union.

The share of the former tsarist empire in world production of pig iron in 1913 was only 5.3 per cent. The share of the Soviet Union in 1928 was only 3.7 per cent, while at the end of 1934 it was already 16.7 per cent. (*Applause.*) At the end of 1934, the Soviet Union took second place in the production of pig iron, coming after the United States but before Great Britain and Germany. (*Applause.*) As for steel, the corresponding figures are 5.5 per cent in 1913, 3.9 per cent in 1928 and 11.7 per cent in 1934. (*Applause.*)

Nothing can serve better than these figures to emphasize the tremendous historic importance of the policy of the C.P.S.U. which, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, has ensured the victorious completion of the Five-Year Plan and has thus created the basis for a radical alteration in the relation of forces between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries. In the sphere of military strength and the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union, this means that the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat has already an armed force and a capacity of defense which are in no way inferior to those of any capitalist country. The workers' and peasants' armies, which in the heroic years of the Civil War were still only armies in the process of construction, and were overcoming the difficulties of the transition period from detachments of Red Guards, full of enthusiasm but only slightly disciplined and badly equipped, into a regular, centralized and disciplined army equipped according to the most modern technique, have been completely reconstructed on the basis of the most modern technique and the industrial progress of the country.

"The Red Army has been transformed from a backward army into a modern, up-to-date army. It has in industry a basis of production which can manufacture all modern implements of war."*

In the Far East, where the direct menace of an imperialist attack is greater, the frontiers of the Soviet Union have ceased to be defenseless frontiers. They are defended by an army which has at its disposal its own military economic base and its own highly developed war industry. (*Applause.*)

This amazing rise of the economic and military power of the Soviet Union is accompanied by the continual growth of the sympathy for and devotion to the workers' state exhibited by the proletariat and the wide masses of the people throughout the capitalist world.

The tremendous authority enjoyed by the Soviet Union not only among the Communist vanguard, but also among the Social-Democratic and non-Party workers, among the small peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and the youth, the fact that millions of people are ready to fight for the defense of the Soviet Union with all their strength, are among the very important factors responsible for the fact that the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat has so strong a position as against the capitalist states.

Taking all these elements into consideration, the conclusion that we must reach is that the relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states have entered a new phase, the basic feature of which is the growing authority of the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its peace policy.

We find repercussions of this new fact in all fields of international policy, and we must most carefully take it into account in determining our policy.

THE AGGRESSION OF JAPANESE IMPERIALISM IN THE FAR EAST

Let us now see what is happening in the capitalist world.

The imperialist power that is the most aggressive, that is feverishly preparing for war, and is already waging war, is, without doubt, Japan. Since 1931 bellicose Japanese imperialism has set about changing the map of the world by armed force. After the military seizure of Manchuria, Japanese

***Voroshilov, Lenin, Stalin and the Red Army.**

imperialism proceeded to occupy Northern China ; it openly showed its intention of establishing its protectorate over all China, and is now preparing to continue its further advance towards the centre of China, aided by its Kuomintang agents, who betrayed the Chinese people and its struggle for independence and national liberation.

The aim pursued by imperialist Japan, and openly avowed by its statesmen, is the establishment of Japanese hegemony not merely in the Far East, but in all Eastern Asia and along the western shores of the Pacific Ocean. To attain this goal, Japan requires, first of all, to create a raw material base for its heavy industry.

The Japanese militarists required the conquest of Manchuria and of Northern China so as to have a base for attacking the Soviet frontiers and to create a spacious hinterland for the armies which will conduct this attack. It is well known that the relation of forces in the Far East at the present time is such that war against the Soviet Union presents itself to Japan as a very difficult matter whose issue is far from being considered as certain, even by a section of the Japanese generals themselves. But on the other hand, consideration of the growing strength of the Soviet Union and of the Red Army drives the most aggressive Japanese militarists to come out against any postponement of the war and in favour of using all opportunities as rapidly as possible and finding allies that could enable them to begin the war today instead of putting it off until tomorrow.

Here is what we read in the pamphlet on the so-called "Defense of the State," published by the Press Bureau of the Japanese General Staff in October 1934 :

"All this [i.e., considerations of the growing military strength of the Soviet Union] obliges us to reflect on the nature of the intentions of the U.S.S.R. If the Japanese Empire does not complete its armaments as a counterpoise to the powerful Red Army, and if in particular it does not strengthen the power of its air forces, it will be very difficult to do so tomorrow.

"And it is superfluous to stress the necessity of increasing the forces now in Manchukuo."

This tendency to accentuate the situation in the Far East dominates the whole of Japanese policy ; it was manifested by the refusal to conclude a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union, by the intrigues through which Japanese diplomacy

links itself with the instigators of war and the enemies of the Soviet Union in Europe, by the increased war preparations now being carried out by the Japanese generals in Manchuria, by the feverish construction in the latter region of new railway lines and strategic roads, by efforts to create an autonomous industrial base on the Asiatic continent, in Manchuria, for the Japanese army, by the continued provocations on the Soviet frontiers on the part of aggressive Japanese-Manchurian circles and their repeated efforts to provoke an armed conflict with the Mongolian People's Republic.

This aggressive policy of Japan is the result of the entire domestic and foreign situation of Japanese imperialism. It must not be forgotten, comrades, that modern Japan is the country of the deepest and sharpest class differentiation. It is a country in which the semi-feudal oppression of the masses of starving peasants is coupled with the most hideous capitalist exploitation. Preparation for war is reflected in the whole life of the country. While inflation and war orders are producing an increase in production and in the profits of the armament manufacturers, real wages are falling. They have dropped by 20 per cent as a result of inflation alone, and by 66 per cent for agricultural workers. The working hours are as high as 14-18 a day. In the countryside there are not less than two million starving families, which means eight to ten million persons. Need one be astonished if the aggressive circles of the Japanese bourgeoisie regard as a challenge the very fact of the existence of the country of socialism, the uninterrupted growth of well-being for the masses and the freedom of the peoples in the U.S.S.R.

The existence of the Chinese Soviet Republic and its revolutionary victories still further increase the aggressiveness of the Japanese brigands. The Soviet regime established in a territory inhabited by one hundred million people and possessing an army of a million men—here is a new gigantic breach in the capitalist world, here is a gigantic barrier to the realization of the plans of pillage of the Japanese brigands. The Japanese imperialists and generals, who consider themselves the vanguard of the whole capitalist world in organizing and provoking war against the Soviet Union, look on Soviet China as a mortal enemy that they want to annihilate at all costs.

The policy of expansion pursued by the Japanese generals is the most reactionary class policy. Their bayonets are

directed primarily and above all against the revolution, but the forces of the revolution will unite and fight with the utmost vigour and enthusiasm to foil their criminal plans. Comrades, if the war which day by day for the past four years has threatened the Far Eastern frontiers of the Soviet Union has still not broken out, we owe it exclusively to the far-sighted and courageous peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*) We greet this policy. And it will be legitimate for us at the same time to send hearty greetings from the platform of this Congress to the glorious Red Army standing on guard at the Far Eastern frontiers of our Socialist Fatherland. (*Stormy and prolonged applause. The delegates rise.*)

Comrades of the Far Eastern Red Army, if the Japanese bandit starts an attack and you rise in overwhelming strength to repel it and to make every imperialist bandit lose forever the inclination to make such attacks, be sure that throughout the world, under the leadership of our Communist Parties, millions of toilers will support your fight with all their strength, to aid you to break the backbone of our class enemy. The workers' and peasants' Red Army in alliance with the international proletariat constitutes a power which no one will ever be able to conquer. (*Applause.*)

THE DRIVE OF FASCISM, THE PRINCIPAL INSTIGATOR OF WAR

Comrades, the victory of fascism in Germany and in a number of other countries in Europe and the general offensive of the fascist movement is the third new fact contributing to determine the international situation to which I wish to draw your attention.

The drive of fascism is a reactionary response of decaying capitalism to the triumph of socialism in the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It proceeds side by side with an extreme sharpening of the class struggle, and hence also with an extreme intensification of the danger of war. Comrade Stalin has repeatedly drawn our attention to the fact that the fascist dictatorship is one of the forms of organization of the hinterland of the bourgeoisie for the new war. The fascist dictatorship is directly linked up with the preparations for war, and it gives the preparations for the new imperialist war a particular stamp and direction. The drive of fascism is the most clearly expressed form of the capitalist world's

sliding into a new world war. The victory of German National-Socialism, which is the most aggressive variety of fascism, is not merely the victory of a party based upon the most unbridled chauvinism and setting the unleashing of war as its immediate goal. It is likewise the victory of a party which proclaims without any reticence that its immediate aim is to undertake a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union, the revolutionary movement of the working class and the movement for the national liberation of the oppressed peoples throughout the world.

German fascism makes its war provocation by the demand for liberation and unification of all Germans living in Europe. In reality, the task it sets itself is that of establishing its own hegemony on the European continent, and counts on attaining this aim by leading a crusade of reaction against the Soviet Union. The aims of the foreign policy of the "Third Empire" of fascism have been expressed so clearly and unambiguously that there can be no doubt about them.

"We National-Socialists," writes Hitler, "thereby consciously put an end to the pre-war trend of foreign policy. We join onto where the end came six hundred years ago. We stop the everlasting procession of Germans to South and West Europe and direct our gaze to the country in the East. We finally put an end to the colonial and trade policy of the pre-war period and go over to the land policy of the future."

"But when today we speak of new land in Europe we can have in mind only Russia and the bordering states subject to it. Fate itself indicates this path to us."

This fundamental direction of the foreign policy of National-Socialism is confirmed by all the activity of the leaders of the "Third Empire," by everything that they have done since their advent to power. The stubborn refusal to sign a pact guaranteeing peace and the frontiers in Eastern Europe is not the least important manifestation of this activity. On May 21, this year, in his last speech on German foreign policy, in a speech which is the height of hypocrisy and demagoguery, Hitler once again confirmed that the entire policy of National-Socialism is aimed at an attack against the Soviet Union. This time he gives a justification much more persuasive than the appeal to the conquering expeditions of the mediaeval Teutonic knights.

"Our moral conceptions," he said, "are diametrically opposed to those of Soviet Russia.... It is Germany that saved Europe from Communism.... National-Socialism cannot call upon its German fellow countrymen, the adherents of National-Socialism, to support a system which we consider our most mortal enemy."

Indeed, no contrast is as profound as that existing between the country of the dictatorship of Hitler fascism and the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. German fascism is the instigator of the most raging capitalist reaction, of bloody oppression of the workers, the toiling peasants, the national minorities and the entire German people. The Soviet power means the liberty of the working class, the liberation of all toilers from all forms of oppression and exploitation, the right of self-determination for all peoples. The Soviet power is the champion of the liberation of all humanity. Fascist Germany is the reign of the magnates of capital and of the feudal landowners. The Soviet Union is the country of emancipated labour, of conscious discipline, of the most advanced culture and progress. German fascism, which is the instigator of the civil war of the dying bourgeoisie against the proletariat, is likewise the champion of war against the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The basis of the war propaganda carried on by the fascist press in calling for the "extirpation of Bolshevism" is along with rabid imperialist aggression, rabid class hatred of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

The fact that, in a country with a population numerically exceeding that of any other country in capitalist Europe, a party is in power which so sharply puts the problem of a war aiming at the destruction of the country of the victorious proletarian revolution—this fact must today occupy the centre of our attention and our work. If it is true that one of the fundamental qualities of Bolshevism, that one of the fundamental features of our revolutionary strategy, is the ability to determine at each moment who is the principal enemy and to be able to concentrate all forces for struggle against that enemy—then it is in the present juncture, and in relation to the present position, that we must particularly give proof of this ability. To concentrate our battle fire against German fascism, as the principal instigator of war and the mortal enemy of the Soviet Union and the proletarian revolution, is the duty of every revolutionary. (Applause.) Whoever fails

to understand this duty fails to understand anything of the forms in which the fight between reaction and revolution is developing in Europe today.

Every concession made to the aggressive policy of fascism facilitates the work of the enemies of peace and is a step forward in the matter of unleashing war.

The fascists will not succeed in imposing on us by the pacifist chatter with which they mask their policy of war. We shall not allow ourselves to be deceived by the hypocritical agitation carried on by the fascist leaders with regard to the national demands of the German population in the various countries of Europe. We have always understood and supported these national demands, we understand them and support them today as well. We are not supporters of the encirclement of Germany, nor of the oppression and violent separation of the mass of German-speaking populations. We are for the complete liberation, social and national, of the German people. We are for the liberty of all the German-speaking peoples, for their right to national unity. But the liberation of the German people will commence, and must inevitably commence, with the overthrow of the fascist regime. The National-Socialist Party, which has subjected the workers and the peasants of Germany to a barbarous regime of concentration camps, prisons and tortures, cannot be a champion of the national liberation of the German-speaking peoples.

The national aspirations of the German-speaking populations in the various countries of Europe are for the fascist leaders nothing but small change, which they cynically put into circulation in order to secure support for their plans of conquest and counter-revolutionary war. Has not Hitler himself given proof of this by sacrificing the interests of the German population of Southern Tyrol?

German fascism is attempting to create reactionary blocs, subordinate to its plans of conquest, by supporting the most reactionary parties and fascist cliques in various countries.

The first concrete act of this policy was the conclusion at the beginning of 1934 of the pact between German National-Socialism and Polish fascism. This pact is essentially different from the majority we have known since the war. It is a secret pact; and this return to the methods of secret diplomacy is also one of the worthy deeds of National-Socialism. What will be said of this return by the Labour Party leaders, who have cherished the illusion that the end of secret diplomacy means

the end of wars and who today in fact indirectly facilitate the fascists' policy in Europe ?

All that is known of the pact between Poland and Germany goes to show that it is an aggressive pact serving the preparations for war. There is not the slightest reference in it to its lack of validity in the case of the signatories themselves being the aggressor. It endeavours to establish a certain co-ordination between Polish and German propaganda and between the action of these two countries among the bands of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary emigres and the counter-revolutionary Ukrainian bourgeoisie. All this means that by the signature of this pact Polish Fascism has joined the plan of Germany's territorial expansion towards the East, the criminal plan for the invasion and colonization of the Soviet Ukraine.

I will not dwell on the fact that the agreement between Poland and Germany is full of contradictions, as has been very strikingly demonstrated recently in connection with the Danzig question. In concluding this pact with the cliques which govern Poland, German National-Socialism has in no way renounced its anti-Polish claims, but has merely desired to recruit assistants for its criminal anti-Soviet adventure. The plan, which consists of diverting the menace of National-Socialist expansion from Poland by directing the menace against the Soviet Union, is a plan worthy of the reactionary adventurers who are ready to hazard even the independence of the Polish people. It is obvious that if German fascism were to succeed in consolidating itself in Europe with the aid of Polish fascism and in realizing even a part of its aims of territorial conquest, the fate of the Polish people would by no means be an enviable one. A minimum of discernment suffices to foresee that the present masters of Germany can only once more put in question the national independence of the Polish people and subject it once more to the threat of partition by violence. And that is what Polish public opinion is more and more coming to realize.

The pact with Poland has served German National-Socialism as a starting point from which to enlarge the network of its intrigues. Its direct consequence has been to aggravate the menace to the frontiers of Czechoslovakia and to the independence of Czechoslovakia, and to make German fascism more aggressive in its struggle to put an end to the independence of the Baltic countries. It has had as its consequence

the extreme aggravation of the Austrian problem. Having destroyed the Franco-Polish alliance, National-Socialism is aiming at the disintegration of the Little Entente and its replacement in Central Europe by a new bloc of fascist powers, the axis of which is to consist of Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria. In promising Yugoslavia a part of the Austrian territories, the German fascists are endeavouring to draw this country also into the bloc, just as they are trying to change the orientation of the foreign policy of Rumania.

The open and shameless assistance which Hitler fascism is giving to the development of the fascist movement in all countries is a component part of this reactionary plan. By using foreign connections in its bellicose drive, German fascism is mobilizing and agitating all the war parties throughout Europe—from England to the Balkans, from Finland to Spain, from Holland to Italy.

Thus we see ever more clearly defined in Europe a group of capitalist states, dominated and directed by the most bellicose and reactionary forces, who are directly interested in an immediate outbreak of war in general and, in particular, of a war directed against the Soviet Union. On the other hand, a group is appearing, consisting of capitalist countries which for the most part have preserved a parliamentary regime and which are more or less interested in the preservation of peace.

There are certain prophets of reaction who have the effrontery to assert that the victory of the reactionary and fascist parties in all countries would facilitate the cause of peace, because these parties, being closest to each other in their ideology, would be able more easily to come to an understanding.

But look at what is going on between fascist Germany and fascist Italy. Germany's raising of the question of the annexation of Austria as the most acute question in Central Europe, the development of a National-Socialist movement and the repeated attempts at a fascist putsch in Austria, have created a direct menace to the frontiers of Italian imperialism. The renewal of the "*Drang nach Osten*" of German imperialism in fascist garb cuts across the lines of imperialist expansion of Italian fascism.

There is thus created a focus of conflicts which undermines all stability of relations and tranquility in Central Europe. To assert that it is possible to base the peace of Europe and of

the whole world on an entente between fascist dictatorships, which have completely reduced the toilers to slavery, is to lie in a most shameless fashion.

In the period immediately following the war it was customary to say that there were in Europe certain particularly dangerous war centres, so-called "Balkanized" regions, where the spark of a war conflagration might arise more easily than elsewhere. Today there is no longer any part of Europe which has not been "Balkanized" in this sense, there is not a corner of the Continent—in the part of it which is still under the capitalist regime—where the states are not ranged against each other, ready to pass in a few hours from the present state of unstable peace, a peace armed to the teeth and very uncertain, to a state of open war.

This is the direct consequence of the drive, the victories and the intrigues of fascism, particularly of German National-Socialism. Each step forward made by fascism and the war parties of the bourgeoisie can only hasten the moment of the plunge of the capitalist world into the abyss of war.

This is one more argument, comrades, and by no means a secondary one for those who ask us why we put the defense of bourgeois-democratic liberties at the centre of our united front and people's front policy. We cannot remain indifferent when witnessing the creation of a state system directed by the most bellicose and chauvinist groups of the bourgeoisie, in the presence of the growth of the extremist war parties throughout the world, and the tendency towards the formation of a bloc of fascist countries for a war against the Soviet Union. In this connection, our task does not consist merely in passively registering events, but in making politics, that is to say, intervening in these events so as to change their course or, at least, to hold back the outbreak of war.

Can one not foresee what a victorious war of German fascism would signify for Europe? Such a war would signify the end of national independence for the Czechs, the Lithuanians and the other little nationalities of the Baltic, as well as for the Poles, Dutch and Belgians. All the peoples of Europe understand this, a proof of which is the enthusiasm with which these peoples whose national independence is threatened by National-Socialism welcomes the ever more active and authoritative participation of the Soviet Union in European politics, because this international activity of the U.S.S.R. bars the road to the offensive of the German fascists.

In concentrating the fire of our struggle against the principal enemy of peace, against German fascism—which does not prevent us from waging an irreconcilable struggle against the imperialism of our “own” countries and against the extreme war parties of the capitalist countries connected with German fascism—we accomplish our role as the supreme defenders of all the liberties and conquests of the working class and toilers, and we defend national freedom.

III. THE POSITION OF THE BIG IMPERIALIST POWERS

WHAT is the policy of the big imperialist powers in the face of the growth of bellicose German fascism and Japanese militarism?

It is essential to bear in mind that war against the Soviet Union is not the sole aim of German National-Socialism and Japanese militarism. They are fighting for their own hegemony. Their attack upon the Soviet Union is only a component part of a general plan of expansion and conquest. These plans, which aim at a new repartition of the world, clash with the whole complex of existing interests and still further intensify the antagonisms between the imperialists, not only in Europe but throughout the world.

Japan's annexation of Manchuria and its aggressive activity aimed at the conquest of the whole of China intensify imperialist rivalries throughout the Pacific Ocean. Both England and the United States are directly affected by this expedition of Japan against China. The antagonisms between Great Britain and the United States are the most profound of all those that tear apart the imperialist world, because they manifest themselves on a world scale, because these two countries encounter one another in every part of the world, and because the goal towards which American imperialism inevitably strives is the undermining of British colonial and maritime supremacy. But the military power of the United States and its strategic position in the Pacific Ocean do not yet correspond to its strength and its economic development, in spite of the tremendous growth of its armaments during the past few years.

Thus we are confronted here by an imperialist state which does not set itself immediate goals of conquest, I emphasize—*immediate goals of conquest*, and which is interested in gaining

time, in postponing an armed conflict as long as possible, and in employing the time thus gained to strengthen its own positions. We witness a number of measures undertaken by the United States for gradually strengthening its position in the Pacific Ocean. These measures are seen in the reinforcement of the already formidable military-naval bases and in the establishment of new bases, both naval and air, in the Western Pacific, the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, etc. All these measures are a response to those of Japan, which endeavours to win positions that would open a path for it towards Southern Asia and the Indian Ocean. The armaments race and the struggle for strategic preparation for war are in full swing in the Far East and the whole Pacific Ocean.

The position adopted by Great Britain is very different from that of the United States. British policy cannot be understood if one confines oneself to emphasizing the contrast between the countries that were late in entering the imperialist struggle of competition and the countries that succeeded in conquering colonial possessions, drawing the hasty conclusion that the former are for war and the latter for peace. The matter is not so simple. Britain, which undoubtedly possesses the greatest colonial empire, does not pursue a policy of peace at all.

In the first place, the defence of an empire extending to every continent requires Britain to react to conflicts that break out or are maturing even at the most remote points, and in the most different regions. Its policy is full of contradictions, and these contradictions in their turn become the source of the instability of its position, the cause of new conflicts.

In the second place, the British bourgeoisie is the champion in regard to suppressing the liberation movements of the colonial peoples, just as the German fascists are the champions in establishing the open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the working class.

As early as 1848 Karl Marx thus defined the role of Britain with regard to the development of the revolution in Europe:

"As in the epoch of Napoleon, England will stand at the head of the counter-revolutionary armies, but through the war itself it will be thrown to the head of the revolutionary movement, and will pay its debt towards the revolution of the eighteenth century." (Karl Marx, article in *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, January 1, 1849.)

The requirements of struggle for preservation of its colonial hegemony, against revolution and against the national-liberation movements remain today, too, the fundamental mainspring of British policy. These requirements are especially put forward by the most reactionary groups of the bourgeoisie. The attitude of British imperialism towards German National-Socialism cannot be otherwise explained. In the recent period Great Britain has repeatedly given its support to National-Socialism against the forces that endeavoured and are endeavouring to oppose the latter's war policy. It is under the open or concealed support of Britain, and even urged on by the latter, that National-Socialism has rebuilt an imperialist German mass army. Britain has legitimized the armaments of imperialist Germany by concluding with Germany the recent naval agreement, which has sanctioned the annulment of the war clauses of the Versailles Treaty, has given the signal for a new race in the building of war fleets in Europe and at the same time has created a new instrument of aggression in the Baltic, at the gates of the Soviet Union.

If we remember that the war of 1914-18 largely arose from the conflict between British imperialism and German imperialism, and that the expansion of National-Socialism takes place in all directions, that it is demanding for itself a new colonial empire and hegemony in Europe, then it is clear that the problem will again present itself just as in 1914-18, but this time in a much sharper fashion. It is easy to understand that the support given to German fascism by die-hard circles of the British bourgeoisie is nothing else than support—direct or indirect—given to the preparation for war against the Soviet Union. British imperialism, and in particular the most reactionary section of the British bourgeoisie (here also the question must be put in a differentiated fashion), considers it to be its "historical" task to deal a mortal blow to the country of socialism, or at least to weaken the Soviet Union for a long period of time by a series of wars in Europe and in the Far East.

Finally, the attitude of Poland, in which British imperialism undoubtedly plays an outstanding role, confirms this statement.

We have here a classic example of the permanent tendency of the imperialist countries to solve their contradictions by organizing intervention against the U.S.S.R. The reactionary British bourgeoisie thinks it can direct the drive of German

and Japanese imperialism that menaces its own positions into an anti-Soviet channel. But in fact the international situation is so complicated today, the different war centres are so closely bound up with one another that any project of "localizing" an imperialist war, or of limiting the war plans of German fascism and Japanese imperialism, is a sheer utopia. The British bourgeoisie, by the concessions and support which it gives to the instigators of war in Europe and in the Far East, accelerates the onset of a new world war into which the British Empire will inevitably be drawn.

A different role is now played by France. The French bourgeoisie is still intelligent enough not to forget that in the gospel of Hitlerism France is depicted as the traditional enemy of German imperialism in Europe. It is still intelligent enough to understand that every step taken by German National-Socialism along the road toward the conquest of hegemony in Europe must inevitably place the security of France and the very integrity of French territory in jeopardy. That is why the French bourgeoisie is particularly conscious of the indivisibility of peace at the present time and is interested in the defense of the status quo, which can only mean defense of peace and opposition to German fascism's unbounded plan of aggression.

Obviously, no one can cherish excessive illusions regarding the consistency of the French bourgeoisie in this peace policy. The position of French imperialism also is full of contradictions which manifest themselves both within the country as well as internationally. For a long time, a considerable section of the French bourgeoisie have cherished plans for agreement with German imperialism. These are the plans of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie, Tardieu, the Fiery Cross, the church and the reactionary elements that are attempting to fascize the army. In making this statement we must at the same time emphasize the fact that the present policy of the French bourgeoisie is nothing but the expression of class relations within the country, in particular of the pressure of the mass of the French people, who do not want an anti-Soviet agreement with Hitler, because they hate the Hitler regime and place their hope in the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is why the united front and people's front policy of our French Communist Party is a guarantee for peace, not only for France, but for the workers of the whole world. (Applause.)

Let us draw a few conclusions from this cursory analysis of the mutual relations of the big imperialist powers:

1. The contrast between the capitalist world and the world of socialism continues to be the deepest contradiction in the present historical period.

2. This contradiction is expressed today especially sharply by the fact that the imperialists of two of the greatest countries, Germany and Japan, are openly calling for war against the Soviet Union, are trying to create a bloc of a number of reactionary and fascist states to prepare and wage this war, and are supported and encouraged in these efforts by the most reactionary strata of the bourgeoisie of the greatest imperialist power, Great Britain.

3. The policy of aggression of German fascism and Japanese militarism leads inevitably to a new accentuation of all international antagonisms, but at the same time to a differentiation in the policy of the great imperialist powers, some of which are interested in the defense of the status quo and in a temporary and conditional defense of peace.

It follows from all this, comrades, that the international situation is particularly tense and acute that war can break out at any moment and at any place, and that any war will inevitably become a world war. It likewise follows from all this that the antagonisms between the big imperialist powers are developing in such a way that at a given moment, under given conditions, they may to a certain extent form an obstacle to the creation of a new bloc of the powers for war against the Soviet Union. This opens wide possibilities for the Soviet policy of peace.

If it is true that differences exist in the positions of the various countries—such as I have just sketched—then we cannot fail to take them into account in determining our revolutionary strategy and our tactics in the fight against war. This is absolutely essential.

Let me remind you of the exceptional clarity which Lenin gave to the theoretical basis for the necessity of this revolutionary strategy:

“It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by more necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every ‘fissure,’ however small, in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interests among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie in the

various countries ; by taking advantage of every possibility, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this, do not understand even a grain of Marxism and of scientific modern socialism in general.”*

As you see, Lenin directly says that it is obligatory to utilize all the contradictions of interests, not only between the bourgeoisie of *different countries*. Lenin speaks here precisely of the attitude of the proletariat to the problem of international policy and war. The directive he gives is obligatory for us above all in determining the foreign policy of the state and of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it is at the same time obligatory for the proletariat and for the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries, in so far as these Parties can and must work out a positive position in deciding problems of international policy, intervening actively in the course of events and aiding tendencies that retard the unleashing of war and hindering everything that constitutes a direct immediate menace to peace.

At the base of our revolutionary strategy, and consequently of our concrete struggle against war, we put the concentration of forces against the Japanese militarists who threaten an onslaught on the Soviet Union at its Eastern frontiers and who are striving to destroy the conquests of the Chinese revolution, and against German fascism—the chief instigator of war in Europe. We endeavour to utilize all differences existing in the positions of the various imperialist powers. We must utilize them skilfully in the interests of the defense of peace, not forgetting for a moment the necessity of delivering a blow against the enemy in our own countries, against our “own” imperialism. (*Applause.*)

*Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” Communism, an Infantile Disorder, p. 52, Little Lenin Library, International Publishers, New York.

IV. THE ATTACK OF FASCIST ITALY ON ETHIOPIA AND THE ACCENTUATION OF COLONIAL QUESTIONS

PERMIT me to dwell on the policy of fascist Italy and its colonial and war expansion in Eastern Africa, aimed primarily against Ethiopia. I shall restrict myself here to four observations.

First observation. By the example of Italy we clearly see that the fascist regime is inevitably drawn into war in virtue of its policy and in virtue of the contradictions of this policy.

Italian fascism cannot boast of having been consistent in its foreign policy. In 1923, immediately after coming to power, Mussolini supported imperialist France in carrying out the military occupation of the Ruhr. In the following years—up to 1934—the basic line of his policy was, on the contrary, that of struggle to undermine the hegemony of French imperialism in Europe by the organization of a bloc of “revisionist” powers. Italian fascism during this period paraded its “traditional friendship” with England, but it intrigued against England in Asia Minor and in the Red Sea. On the shores of Arabia it fomented the war of the Arab kingdom of the Yemen against the Arab kingdom of the Hedjaz, the vassal of the British Empire.

Today it is struggling against British imperialism over the Ethiopian question. The fascist newspapers threaten Britain with the destruction of the formidable naval base of Malta within a half hour. There is a single basic cause for this succession of somersaults in the foreign policy of Italian fascism, viz., the search for a solution by arms of the domestic and foreign problems and contradictions of the fascist regime. The hankering for war in order to consolidate the bases of the dictatorship by military victories haunts the leaders of the fascist regime. All the turns of international policy serve them as a pretext. It is only the military weakness of Italy in comparison with other big imperialist powers, plus the lack of chauvinism among the people, that has restrained Italian imperialism from war. The Italian people that fought heroically on the barricades in the years of civil war during the struggle for national independence, when it was conscious of fighting for its liberty and for its rights, does not intend to fight for the colonial adventures of its hated rulers. (Applause.)

Second observation. The conflict with Ethiopia is likewise

the last stage of the evolution of the nationalist and chauvinist demagoguery of fascism, the conclusion of the so-called people's campaigns with the aid of which fascism has endeavoured to deceive the masses. Fascism has launched new demagogic campaigns at each difficulty, at each aggravation of the country's situation. But a moment comes when all demagoguery ceases to avail and fascism, under the whip of its own unbridled chauvinism, under the drive of the bourgeois groups that are most interested in a warlike outcome, precipitates itself into the war which it has preached as a healing remedy for the world and as an inevitable necessity for the solution of the problems facing the world. War is the last wisdom of fascist regimes.

Third observation. The bellicose campaign of Italy in Eastern Africa has had as its consequence the accentuation of its relations with the big capitalist powers, not only in the area affected by the Italian attack, but in all other areas as well. In Europe, the repercussions of this campaign are already today extremely powerful and will become still stronger if an armed conflict breaks out. In fact, there is not a single capitalist state which is not directly or indirectly affected by this conflict. Great Britain, which is opposing Italy's war policy for alleged pacific reasons, is guided in fact by selfish imperialist interests, seeing in the occupation of Ethiopia by Italy a first concrete act modifying the map of colonial possessions in Africa, and thus raising in practice the question of a new repartition of the world. At the moment when the demand for colonies is the subject of a huge mass campaign in Germany and is being raised even by Poland, this is a very dangerous precedent.

France would prefer to let Italy have freedom of action, for it does not want to lose the latter's support which will be necessary for it at the decisive hour. On the other hand, however, it fears that if Italy is occupied in Africa, a sharp intensification of the situation may take place at any moment in Europe, where German fascism is only waiting for an opportunity to realize its plans in Austria, in the Danube Basin and on the Italian frontier.

Even Japan, which is 12,000 kilometers away from East Africa, and which does not yet have such large interests in Ethiopia as it tries to indicate, intervenes none the less in the conflict with considerable noise, seeing in it an excellent pretext for covering its own imperialist visage with a mask as

protector of the coloured races.

The impossibility of erecting barriers to separate the different points of friction between the big imperialist powers, the impossibility of localizing any conflict breaking out between them, is plainly shown by the example of Ethiopia. *Peace is indivisible.*

The last but not the least important observation. The attack of fascist Italy on Ethiopia will inevitably result in a new sharpening of the antagonisms and open struggle between the imperialist world and the colonial peoples. For the time being the struggle of the Negro peoples of Central and Eastern Africa, which has been going on for decades, has been in abeyance. During these decades, the Negroes in Africa have been subjected to a regime not only of exploitation and enslavement but of veritable physical extermination. The crisis years accentuated the horrors of the colonial regime enforced by the Europeans on the immense black continent. On the other hand, in the war which they waged in Lybia in 1924-29, the Italian fascists gave a proof of how fascism conducts its colonizing activity. In this sphere also, fascism has proved to be the most barbarous form of the domination of the bourgeoisie.

The war of Italy in Lybia was conducted from start to finish as a war of extermination of the native population. It ended in the massacre of 20,000 natives—men, women and children—who had been driven by armed force into the most arid part of the country, where they died from hunger and thirst and were exposed to machine gun fire from airplanes.

A war of fascism against the last free native state of Africa will produce reaction and indignation in all black Africa, in all the Arab countries and in Mohammedan India. The first symptoms of this indignation are already visible.

The *Temps* of July 24, 1935 published the following information:

“ And thus it is that at the present time in Somaliland, Kenya, Uganda and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, both in the bazaars and in the forests, by the fire for driving off beasts of prey, the natives talk about the war which the Sultan of Ethiopia will have to wage against the foreigners—without distinguishing between the Italians, the French and the British—against these white men who bring peace in the territories which they have conquered only by imposing a mass of laws which are contrary to the century-old customs of the blacks....

"In other words, the Italian-Ethiopian conflict in a few months has done more to stir up or re-awaken the spirit of African nationalism, which fell into a state of lethargy when Khartoum was retaken by Lord Kitchener in 1899, than would be accomplished by years of the anti-foreigner, pan-African and pan-Islam propaganda which derives its origin partly from certain American Negroes and partly from certain anti-European Arab committees which are well known to our Intelligence Service."

We must bear in mind these observations of the bourgeois colonizers when we trace the prospect of the formation of a revolutionary situation in association with the prospect of war.

Ethiopia is an economically and politically backward country. No trace of a national-revolutionary movement or even a simple democratic movement has yet been in evidence there. It is a country, moreover, in which the transition from a feudal regime, organized on the basis of semi-independent tribes, to a centralized monarchy is taking place rather slowly. But this is not the decisive question for determining our attitude towards the war contrived by Italy.

Our Italian Communist Party was perfectly right in taking a defeatist position towards the imperialist war of Italian fascism and in launching the slogan "Hands off Ethiopia." And I can assure you that if the Negus of Ethiopia, by defeating the plans of conquest of fascism, helps the Italian proletariat to strike a death blow at the regime of the blackshirts, no one will reproach it with being "backward." The Ethiopian people is the ally of the Italian proletariat against fascism, and from this platform we assure it of our sympathy. The revolutionary traditions of the Italian people, the traditions of Garibaldi's Volunteers—these traditions in whose name the first Italian internationalists with sincere enthusiasm entered the ranks of the fighters in Poland and Hungary, in Greece and South America, in every place where the banner of struggle was raised for national liberty, these traditions bring the Italian toilers to the side of the Ethiopian people against the fascist bourgeoisie.

Our Second World Congress in 1920 greeted the struggle of the oppressed peoples of Asia against imperialism as an integral part of the world revolution. It pledged all revolutionaries to support this struggle with all their power and by all means. Today, in face of the prospect that new reserves of the anti-imperialist revolution in the enormous African continent will be drawn into the struggle, owing to the assault

of fascism, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International once more proclaims that the Communists are the *vanguard of every struggle against imperialism.*

V. OUR CENTRAL SLOGAN—THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

IN face of the frightful reality of the capitalist world which is rushing into war, millions and millions of men, women, youth, and soldiers ask with anxiety: "Is our fate irrevocably fixed? Is it not possible to prevent this terrible scourge which threatens us?"

We Communists, the vanguard of the working class, can reply to this question. We know that war is an inevitable accompaniment of the capitalist regime. Capitalist society, which is based on the exploitation of man by man and the hunt for profit, cannot avoid giving rise to war. But we know equally well that all questions of the development of human society are decided in the final analysis by struggle—by the struggle of the masses. We launch our appeal to the great masses who do not want war:

"Let us unite our forces. Let us fight together for peace. Let us organize the united front of all who want to defend and preserve peace."

Even at the gravest moments, the struggle for peace is not a hopeless one. It is not hopeless because, in struggling for peace, we support ourselves now on the strength of the working class which has the power in its hands in the U.S.S.R. Note what the Soviet Union has achieved. War has already menaced its frontiers for years. But by fighting tenaciously for peace, by sacrificing all that it was possible to sacrifice for the cause of peace, by relying on its powerful strength, it has been able to avoid war up to the present. If the Soviet Union had not existed, the breathing space between the two cycles of wars would not have been so long. The peoples would long ago have been thrown into a new slaughter. Our struggle for peace in which we rely on the strength of the Soviet Union, has, therefore, every chance of being successful. Every month, every week, which we gain is of enormous value for humanity. *Conscious of the deepest aspirations of the masses and the vital*

interests of all humanity, the Communist International puts itself at the head of the campaign for the defense of peace and the Soviet Union... The slogan of peace becomes our central slogan in the fight against war. *

The polemic conducted by Lenin during the World War against the Trotskyists over the slogan of peace was a polemic against the Menshevik tendency to counterpose the slogan of peace to the slogan of defeatism and the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie. In fact, during the imperialist war, the problem could no longer be that of fighting to maintain peace, but of utilizing the deep crisis and the wave of hatred against the capitalist world created by the war in order to unleash the proletarian revolution and overthrow the class domination of the bourgeoisie. It was the imperialist powers which spoke to the people of a "just" and "democratic" peace in order to hide the imperialist aims of their war and to rally the masses to the chauvinist policy of defense of the fatherland.

Comrades, we not only do not hide the slogan of the conversion of imperialist war into civil war, which, in case of war, remains the fundamental slogan of Bolsheviks, but by fighting desperately for peace we desire, as the result of this fight, to unite around the revolutionary vanguard the masses of the workers, toiling peasants and also the petty bourgeoisie, which the proletariat must lead along the path of the conversion of imperialist war into civil war against the bourgeoisie.

But "the conversion of imperialist war into civil war signifies above all *revolutionary mass actions*."* These actions will be all the more possible and all the more threatening for the bourgeoisie, the deeper we succeed in penetrating among the masses and linking ourselves with them, conducting a struggle for the defense of peace prior to the outbreak of war, for the defense of peace which is the most profound desire of the toilers.

If in the period immediately following the war we did not put the slogan of peace at the center of our agitation, it was because for everyone "peace" then meant the peace of Versailles, which we condemned and against which we were fighting. We wanted to avoid even indirectly seeming to give our support to the Versailles system. Today, when the Versailles system has crumbled and German National-Socialism is

*Thesis of the Sixth World Congress.

striving to provoke a new war with the aim of forcing on the peoples of Europe a system of oppression still more monstrous than that of Versailles, the defense of peace receives an entirely different content.

We defend peace, not because we are numbered among the flabby Tolstoyans, but because we are striving to ensure the conditions for the victory of the revolution. If war breaks out tomorrow, we shall enter the struggle with the greatest determination and fight with all our forces, knowing that this struggle will be a life and death struggle between us and the bourgeoisie. We know that our forces are not negligible. But are they equal to the tremendous tasks confronting us today? The united front of the working class has up to now achieved notable successes only in a single big capitalist country. The question of re-establishing the political unity of the working class in a single revolutionary party is only now beginning to be raised. We are, however, still far from its solution:

"It is in the interest of capital," wrote Lenin, "to destroy its enemy (the revolutionary proletariat) bit by bit, before the workers in all countries have united (actually united, i.e., by beginning the revolution). It is in our interest to do all that is possible to take advantage of the slightest opportunity to postpone the decisive battle until the moment (or 'till after') the revolutionary ranks of the single great international army have been united."*

By making the fight for peace the center of our activity, we give the lie in the most striking manner to all the various slanderers, ranking from the bourgeoisie to the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists, who have the effrontery to say that Communists are in favour of war, that they base their hopes on war, as if they think that only war will create a situation in which it will be possible to fight for the revolution, for the conquest of power.

We know quite well that in many countries, above all in those which have a fascist dictatorship, there are toilers who are inclined to think that only war can give their class the possibility of renewing the revolutionary struggle. We noted such tendencies in Italy, we note them now in Germany. We know that such tendencies show themselves above all among the elements which have been demoralized by the defeats in-

*Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, "'Left-Wing' Childishness and Petty Bourgeois Mentality."

flicted on the working class. They can be noted in our ranks among opportunist elements who deny the possibility of carrying on mass work and struggle under all conditions, utilizing even the slightest legal possibilities. Any concession to these tendencies or to these elements who desire the outbreak of war, even if they mask their opportunism by revolutionary phrases, can only separate us from the masses. Moreover, we already know by experience that all those who, inside the working class movement, exalted imperialist war as a means of clearing the path to revolution, have inevitably been driven in the final analysis to break their contacts with the working class and are today in the camp of fascism.

In struggling for peace we are carrying out the best defense of the Soviet Union. No one can doubt that the coming war, even if it were to begin as a war between two big imperialist powers, or as a war of a big power against a small country, will inevitably tend to develop into and will inevitably become a war against the Soviet Union. Every year and every month of respite is a guarantee for us that the Soviet Union will be in a position to repulse more strongly the attack of the imperialists. Our struggle for peace is thus directly linked up with the peace policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The cause of peace and the cause of defending the Soviet Union become a single cause, and not a single worker will refuse to fight for it.

VI. THE PEACE POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

I THINK that no toiler, nor anyone, can doubt that the policy of the Soviet Union is a policy of peace. The fact that the Soviet Union pursues a policy of peace is not accidental, is not dependent upon any transient state of things. This policy is organically connected with the very nature of Soviet Power, with the entire history of its development, with all that it is and does.

In 1917, was not the slogan of peace one of the main slogans with which the Bolsheviks proceeded to conquer power? The Soviet government from the very first days of its existence presented itself to the masses as the government that strove for the ending of the imperialist war and for peace. The decree on peace was the first decree which after a report by Lenin,

was passed by the Congress of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies on November 8, 1917, immediately after the formation of the Soviet government. This decree, which proposed the immediate conclusion of a genuine democratic peace and the annulment of all the treaties of the war period, was not followed by the conclusion of peace because it was rejected by all the imperialist powers. But this decree secured for the Soviet government the unshakable support of the wide masses of the toilers and helped the Soviet government to win that mass basis, which since then has been more and more enlarged and consolidated.

This indestructible linking up of the masses of workers and peasants with their Soviet government, on the basis of a policy of peace, was reinforced by the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, which offers us an example of the conditions the German imperialists would have imposed on the whole world if they had succeeded in completely realizing their plans.

In waging a determined struggle against the petty-bourgeois adventurism of the so-called "Left" Communists who, in the days of Brest-Litovsk, dreamed of a "revolutionary" war, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party stressed before the masses that the Soviet government was not pursuing a policy of "prestige," but was guided in its foreign policy exclusively by the interests of the preservation and strengthening of the positions held by the revolution.

"Our entire policy and propaganda," wrote Lenin in this connection, "is by no means directed towards drawing the peoples into war, but to put an end to war. Experience also has sufficiently demonstrated that only the Socialist Revolution is a way out of perpetual wars.... But if in doing everything it is in our power to do to accelerate this revolution we find ourselves in the position of a weak Socialist Republic which is being attacked by the imperialist robbers, are we correct in our policy of taking advantage of the dissension between them so as to make their combining against us more difficult? Of course, such a policy is correct. We have pursued it for four years. And the most important fact manifesting this policy was the Brest Peace. While German imperialism was showing resistance, we, by making use of the contradictions of the imperialists among themselves, succeeded in maintaining ourselves even when the Red Army was not yet created."*

Thanks to this policy of peace the Soviet Union has been successful up to now in smashing all the plans of isolation and

**Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXVI, Russian ed.*

encirclement concocted against it by the imperialists. All imperialist states of any importance at all have been constrained to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. has concluded non-aggression pacts with all countries with which it has common boundaries, the only exception being Japan, which has refused to conclude such a pact. From the Genoa conference in 1922, right down to the Disarmament Conference, the Soviet Union has continually and energetically raised the question of complete disarmament. When its proposals for complete disarmament were rejected it came forward with the proposal for partial disarmament, fighting to the very end to diminish the war danger.

In the post-war period, Social-Democracy was in power in quite a number of countries. But is there a single Social-Democratic government that did one-hundredth part as much in the cause of peace as the Soviet Union has done? Is there a single Social-Democratic government which declared for the abrogation of all secret treaties concluded by the bourgeoisie for the preparation of war, which solemnly renounced so-called "historical" rights clashing with the interests of other countries or the interests of peace?

The Soviet government gives us an example of how the fight for peace must be conducted by its coolness and resoluteness in relation to all the provocations of the Japanese generals. Is there, has there ever been a government that was able to do in the defense of peace what the Soviets did when they proceeded to sell the Chinese Eastern Railway? The U.S.S.R. has shown in this case how one must act if one desires to avoid war. Only the working class in power is able to pursue such a cool, and, at the same time, bold policy of peace.

By its peace policy the Soviet Union has proved that only socialism means peace. It is for this reason that this policy has mobilized and mobilizes the proletarians of all countries to fight for socialism, and rallies around the working class millions of toilers, peasants and intellectuals who hate war and are striving to preserve peace.

But comrades, the peace policy of the Soviet Union is not a policy of capitulation to the enemy, is not a policy causing the U.S.S.R. to close its eyes to realities, to renounce defense of the gains of the Revolution.

"The development of capitalism," wrote Lenin in 1916, "proceeds very unevenly in the various countries. This cannot be otherwise under commodity production."

It inevitably follows from this that socialism cannot be victorious simultaneously in *all* countries. It will be victorious first in one, or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This must not only create friction, but a direct striving on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the socialist state. In these cases war on our part would be a legitimate and just war, it would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other peoples from the bourgeoisie. Engels was quite right when in his letter to Kautsky, September 12, 1882, he openly admitted the possibility of 'wars of defense' on the part of *already victorious* socialism. What he had in mind was the defense of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries."*

From this historically determined inevitability of the attack of the imperialists against the socialist state, pointed out by Lenin as early as 1916, arises the necessity for the U.S.S.R. to defend itself and to possess for this purpose a powerful army. But we must emphasize that this army is by its nature an entirely different army from the armies of all other countries. A war which this army will be compelled to wage will always be a just war of defense.

"The old army," we read in the introductory portion of the decree on the organization of the Red Army, "was an instrument for the class oppression of the toilers by the bourgeoisie. When power passed to the toilers and to the exploited classes, the necessity arose of creating a new army to be the support of the Soviet government at the present time, the basis for supplanting in the near future the regular army by a general arming of the people and to serve as a support for the coming socialist revolution in Europe."

And indeed, since the existence of the Red Army we have for the first time in history a situation where a formidable armed force is put at the service of the cause of peace. Note the hypocrisy with which the representatives of the imperialists at Geneva discussed for years whether it is possible to put an armed force at the service of the so-called international organization of peace. They discussed it only in order to arrive at the conclusion that this was an unrealizable dream. The armies of the imperialists can indeed never be instruments of peace, because of their very class character. But the class

*Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, "The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution."

cent of the divisional commanders and the commanders of army the service of peace and inspires terror into the hearts of the fascists, the aggressors, the war incendiaries. The Red Army is an army of peace because it is the army of the working class.

On January 1, 1930, 31.2 per cent of the Red Army were workers. On January 1, 1934, the percentage of workers had risen to 45.8, while at the beginning of this year it was 48.3 per cent. But this percentage increases on passing from the mass of the membership of the Red Army to its middle and upper commanding cadres. The contradiction which tears apart the bourgeois armies, where the mass of soldiers consists of peasants and workers, while the commanding cadres consist of representatives of the most reactionary classes and cliques, this contradiction is unknown to the Red Army. Seventy-two per cent of the regimental commanders are workers, 90 per cent of the divisional commanders and the commanders of army corps consist 100 per cent of working class elements. (*Applause.*) Is a more concrete proof necessary to show that the Red Army is an instrument of peace held in the firm hands of the working class?

The workers and collective farmers who form the overwhelming majority in the Red Army are no longer "soldiers." They are a part of that wonderful Soviet youth whose representatives we greeted at the opening session of our Congress and who constitute the sole example in the world of a new generation, free, mighty, joyful and confident of the future.

They are the sons of the heroes of the Civil War. They are a youth which has learned the conscious, voluntary discipline of socialist labour in the factory and the collective farm. They are a youth which knows that it owes to the Revolution and the Soviet Power that it has been spared the horror of capitalist factories, of unemployment, of material and spiritual misery. This youth is imbued with the psychology of creation, because the land in which they were born is the only country where factories, cities, socialist industry, collective farms, a new life, are being built on a grandiose scale, because the Soviet Union is the land of the pioneers of a new civilization, the land of peace. The psychopathic urge for conquest, decadent raptures over bloodshed and predatory wars as the sole "sanitary measures" for humanity, can be engendered only in countries of decaying capitalism.

The proletarians in the capitalist countries know that the Red Army is headed by the most devoted fighters for the Revo-

lution. They know that at the head of the Red Army stands our Comrade Voroshilov, a champion of the proletarian revolution, the son of a railroad worker and a charwoman, a man who at the age of seven worked in a coal mine at a wage of ten kopeks per day, who, a smith by profession, a member of the Bolshevik Party even before the Revolution of 1905, a man whose entire life is linked with the struggles of the vanguard of the Russian workers under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, one who has always been a most disciplined Bolshevik, one of the best pupils of Lenin and Stalin. *(The delegates stand and give a mighty ovation in honour of Comrade Voroshilov.)*

Will not the miners from the Ruhr and the north of France, will not the unfortunate workers in the textile factories of Japan recognize in Comrade Voroshilov and in the other leaders of the Red Army their class brothers and comrades-in-arms?

The revolutionary workers of the whole world know that in the ranks of the Red Army the percentage of Bolshevik Party members and Young Communist League members is steadily increasing. They know that the workers' and peasants' Red Army, created by Lenin, which was forged during the Civil War under the direct leadership of Lenin and was led to victory by the great Stalin, is guided by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the sole Party so far which has given an example of persistent and victorious struggle against imperialist war.

Every step forward, therefore, in strengthening the workers' and peasants' Red Army is greeted with greatest joy by all exploited and by all friends of peace in all the capitalist countries.

The international proletariat knows and understands that humanity would long ago have been dragged into the abyss of war if it had not been for the Red Army; it understands that the existence of this powerful force is the guarantee of peace and of the victory of the working class.

I am convinced that I express the will of all those present at this Congress, the will of the toilers of the whole world, in sending our most ardent greetings to the Red Army.

Long live the workers' and peasants' Red Army, the bulwark of peace, the army of socialism and revolution, the hope of the workers of the whole world! *(Prolonged, stormy applause.)*

VII. MUTUAL AID PACTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT

COMRADES, since the peace policy of the Soviet Union presumes the consideration by the proletarian state of the contradictions between the capitalist countries, its bounds are determined in their extent by the magnitude, intensity and nature of these contradictions, and its concrete forms cannot but change when the international situation changes as a whole.

This has not been understood by those who have evinced astonishment at the modification in the Soviet Union's attitude towards the League of Nations. The League of Nations was formed as an international organization under the leadership of the Entente powers for the purpose of maintaining the "order" established by the post-war treaties. From the day of its foundation it has been undermined by antagonisms and conflicts. But when the problem of the repartition of the world reached an extreme accentuation, when some of the big imperialist powers, which thought that the hour had struck when this problem could be solved by force of arms, developed their war drive, the League of Nations began to disintegrate.

The masses see that the League showed its impotence in face of the seizure of Manchuria by Japan, in face of the wars waged by the vassals of the United States and Great Britain in South America, and in face of the aggression of fascist Italy against Ethiopia. But this impotence is accompanied by hesitation and resistance on the part of the powers which at the moment are not directly interested in war. The most aggressive countries have left the League of Nations: Japan in 1932, Germany in 1934, and the League of Nations, although formally making no alteration in its organization and statutes, nevertheless offers a certain obstacle to the realization of the plans of these powers and can be utilized to postpone the outbreak of war. The Soviet Union took this situation into account when it changed its attitude toward the League of Nations. The entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations showed the masses that the leaders of the Soviet Union are not doctrinaires, but Marxists who correctly appraise the relation of forces existing in the capitalist world and who know how to make use of even the smallest possibility to extend their action in defense of peace and in the interests of the revolution.

The entry into the League of Nations was followed by

further still bolder steps in the unfolding of the peace policy of the Soviet Union in proportion as the threat of war increased and the contradictions sharpened between the countries that are instigators of war and the countries that at the moment are interested in the preservation of peace. This contradiction can be made use of to a greater extent than all previous ones because it determined the temporary coincidence of the permanent aims of the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the temporary aims of the policy of certain capitalist countries.

The U.S.S.R. took a great step forward towards the rapprochement between it and several small weak states, whose independence, as we have already pointed out, is threatened by the war plans of German fascism. The rapprochement with these states, for which the aggression of National-Socialism represents an exceptionally concrete and serious danger, led, as you know, to formulating the definition of an aggressor. This definition is of interest to us here less as a diplomatic event than as the concrete expression of the real connection which is coming into being between the workers of the Soviet Union who are defending the achievements of the proletarian revolution on the one hand, and on the other, the small peoples and small nations that are defending their liberty and national integrity, and all the friends of peace.

Realizing the role which the national question plays in the life of the peoples, we have to reckon on the absolute probability that in case of a war provoked by German fascism, certain peoples of Europe who have secured their independence at the cost of great suffering will prefer, in order to preserve it, to fight on the side of the Soviet Union as the only country in the world where the national question has been solved in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples by granting to every nationality the right of self-determination. At all events we know that this is in the interests of the peoples of Czechoslovakia, Lithuania and a number of other small states, and that it is the duty of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class to prevent the bourgeoisie of these countries from pursuing a policy which runs counter to these interests.

The proposal for the conclusion of the Eastern Pact was made after establishing the definition of the aggressor. Being based on recognition of peace as indivisible and of the impossibility of separating the danger of war menacing the East of Europe from the threat of war in the West, this proposal was intended to achieve the result of putting the instigators of war

into a difficult position and of rallying all friends of peace, whoever they were.

As is well known, the proposal for the conclusion of an Eastern Pact was rejected by the warmongers, and this was bound to be followed by the establishment of an especially close connection between the Soviet Union and the states interested in active resistance to the present aggressors which has led to the conclusion of pacts of mutual aid between the Soviet Union on the one hand and France and Czechoslovakia on the other.

The question of these mutual aid pacts is one which is of the greatest interest at this moment to international working class public opinion. It is necessary that we should dwell on it in more detail. The mutual aid pacts concluded by the Soviet Union are in accordance with the line of development of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, the foundations of which were laid down by Lenin. They are peace pacts, publicly arrived at, open to all, and by no means secret war agreements like those which were concluded by tsarist diplomacy or the pact which has been concluded between German fascism and fascist Poland. At the same time, they are profoundly different from all those platonic acts and declarations, entirely empty of any real political content and inspired solely by hypocrisy, such as the declarations with which post-war diplomacy has made us familiar beginning with the Kellogg Pact, and extending right up to the final declaration of the Disarmament Conference.

The mutual aid pacts concluded by the Soviet Union are acts of a serious, positive political character, aiming at uniting all forces which it is possible to attract at this moment to active defense of peace. On this account we are surprised that anyone could find it strange that the conclusion of the mutual aid pact with France was accompanied by a declaration of Comrade Stalin, in which he expressed "complete understanding and approval of the policy of national defense pursued by France for maintaining its armed forces at the level corresponding to the needs of its security." Rather, I am of the opinion that it would have been strange if a declaration of this kind had not followed, for the absence of such a precise definition of standpoint would have deprived the mutual aid pact of all its efficacy as an instrument of positive peace policy.

From the point of view of theory, the possibility under certain conditions of concluding an agreement envisaging even military collaboration between the working class state and a

capitalist state is not open to doubt. Lenin wrote about this more than once.

In May, 1918, when a proposal for a military agreement was made to the Soviet Republic by the Anglo-French allies, the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party rejected the proposal on grounds, not of *principle* but of *simple political expediency*, not considering such an agreement useful in the existing circumstances. Lenin wrote at the time:

“Without renouncing in general military agreements with one of the imperialist coalition against the other in cases where such an agreement, without violating the basis of Soviet Power, could reinforce the position of the latter and paralyze the attack of any imperialist power against it, we at the present moment cannot accept a military agreement with the Anglo-French coalition.”*

Thus, comrades, the position of the Bolsheviks in regard to this question is absolutely clear. Without violating the basis of Soviet power, but, on the contrary, reinforcing this basis, they do everything necessary so as not to have against them a consolidated bloc of capitalist countries. They consider, and, of course, quite rightly, that the infantry, cavalry, guns, tanks and bombing planes of German fascism are something very concrete, and they strive to oppose them by something equally concrete. The proletariat of the Soviet Union and the Bolshevik Party in power in the Soviet Union cannot and should not adopt any other attitude.

And what of our Parties in the capitalist countries? It is precisely on them that our enemies of all shades and varieties attempted to concentrate their attacks; they looked for some contradiction alleged to exist between Comrade Stalin's declaration and the policy of the Communist Parties, particularly in France and Czechoslovakia, which are struggling against their own bourgeoisies, refusing to vote military budgets, in France voting against the two-years military service law, etc. The bourgeoisie began this line of attack, they were followed by the Socialists, and very soon the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists and renegades of all kinds outdid all the rest in lying slanders.

Taken as a whole, our Parties succeeded in judging the situation correctly. There have been some waverings, there have been individual comrades who have been able to think

*Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX, Russian ed.

that the conclusion of the mutual aid pacts means losing sight of the perspective of revolution in Europe. Practical experience has rapidly convinced these comrades that they were grossly mistaken and that, on the contrary, the new pact by which the Soviet Union confirmed its peace policy could only enhance the prestige of the proletarian state in the eyes of the toilers of all countries, in the eyes of the whole world, and consequently also the prestige of socialism and the proletarian revolution. The bourgeois who imagined that they could throw the Communist movement into confusion by their declaring that it was now they who were in agreement with the Communists, with the Bolsheviks, with the Soviet Union, have been grossly deceived. The masses in France and in Czechoslovakia replied: If it is true that the Soviets acted rightly, well then we shall vote for the Communists, but, of course, for the real ones.

There have been comrades who have compared the conclusion of the mutual aid pacts to a compulsory retreat under the pressure of the enemy. But these few comrades have only demonstrated that they are not able to distinguish between a retreat and an advance. Could one conceive a more remarkable success than the fact that a big capitalist country is compelled to sign an agreement of mutual aid with the Soviet Union, an agreement the content of which is defense against an aggressor, defence of peace and of the frontiers of the country of proletarian dictatorship?

In spite of the few waverings mentioned, all our Sections, and in particular the Communist Parties in countries directly interested in this question, have shown a very high degree of political maturity. They have understood that as far as they were concerned it was important not only to understand and approve an act emphasizing the peace policy of the Soviet Union, but that it was essential to determine their own political line, taking account of the situation in which they are placed, a situation which is profoundly different from that of the Bolshevik Party and working class in the U.S.S.R.

For us it is absolutely indisputable that there is a complete identity of aim between the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the policy of the working class and Communist Parties of the capitalist countries. There is not, and cannot be, any doubt in our ranks on this subject. We not only defend the Soviet Union in general, but we defend concretely its whole policy and each of its actions. But this identity of aim by no means signifies that at every given moment there must

be a complete coincidence in all acts and on all questions between the tactics of the proletariat and Communist Parties that are still struggling for power and the concrete tactical measures of the Soviet proletariat and the C.P.S.U., which already have power in their hands in the Soviet Union.

Examples of this non-coincidence between the position of the Party of the proletariat in various countries in regard to some concrete question could be multiplied.

Let us take, for example, the policy of the Bolshevik Party in 1917, after the February Revolution. During this period the task of the working class and of its revolutionary vanguard throughout the capitalist world consisted in struggling for the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie, that is to say, in struggling for a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist order. But, in Russia, after the February Revolution, the position of the working class was different to that in other countries, for in Russia the first act of the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war had already been accomplished. In all other countries, the working class could achieve the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war only by struggling to overthrow the national coalition governments then in power. In Russia, on the contrary, the aim which Lenin put before the vanguard of the working class during the first period after February was not that of the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government.

"Now it was no longer possible to advance directly to the overthrow of the government, because it was bound up with the Soviets, which were under the influence of the defensists, and the Party would have had to wage war both against the government and against the Soviets, which was beyond its strength."*

It was necessary, above all, to win over the masses to Bolshevism and to strive for the creation of a government based on the Soviets, where the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries still had a majority; this would allow of unmasking the counter-revolutionary policy of these petty-bourgeois parties and isolating them from the masses. It was necessary, therefore, to overthrow the Provisional Government, but "not immediately and not along the usual lines."

*Stalin, *The October Revolution*, p. 75, International Publishers, New York.

Was the aim for which the Bolsheviks were struggling in Russia and the revolutionary Social-Democrats in other countries the same? Yes, it was the same! But was there at that particular time a complete coincidence in the position of the Bolsheviks in Russia and of the revolutionary Social-Democrats in the other countries on this central question of attitude towards the government? No, no such coincidence existed, and its absence was a consequence of the different degree of development of the revolutionary struggle and the difference in the relation of the class forces in the different countries.

It was just for this reason that Lenin wrote that the Bolsheviks under Tseretelli and Kerensky were no longer defeatists, although the supreme goal of their policy remained as before the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. In this domain, the same revolutionary policy demanded from the working class of all countries after the February revolution, under the Tseretelli-Kerensky government, different tactics from those of the working class in the capitalist countries where the revolution was not yet so far advanced.

A classic example of non-comprehension of the fact that the tactical positions of the proletarian Parties, in regard to the same concrete question, need not necessarily be identical in all countries is provided by Lenin in the discussion in 1916 with Kievsky on the right of nations to self-determination. In regard to self-determination, Kievsky then accused Lenin of "interpreting the demand dualistically."

"He," wrote Lenin, "thinks we are 'dualists,' first, because we call upon the workers in the oppressing nations to do *something different*—in relation only to the national problem—from that which we call upon the workers in the oppressed nations to do."

"In order to determine whether, or not P. Kievsky's 'monism' is the same as Duehring's 'monism,' we must see what the *objective* situation is."

"Is the *actual* condition of the workers in the oppressing nations the same as that of the workers in the oppressed nations from the standpoint of the national problem?"

"No, they are not the same."*

Pointing out further that Kievsky's words about the "monistic action of the International" are an "empty sonorous

*Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 290-291, International Publishers, New York.

phrase, and nothing more," Lenin continues :

"In order that the action of the International, which in *real life* consists of workers who are *divided* into those belonging to oppressing nations and those belonging to oppressed nations, may be monistic action, propaganda must be carried on *differently* in each case. This is how we must argue from the point of view of real (not Duehring) monism, from the point of view of Marxian materialism !

"An example ? We have (in the legal press over two years ago !) given the example of Norway, and nobody has attempted to refute us. In this concrete case taken from life, the *action* of the Norwegian and Swedish workers was 'monistic,' unified, internationalist, *only* because and in so far as the Swedish workers *unconditionally* championed the right of Norway to secede, while the Norwegian workers raised the question of secession *only conditionally*. If the Swedish workers had not been *unconditionally* in favour of the right of the Norwegians to secede they would have been *chauvinists*, brothers-in-arms of the chauvinist Swedish landlords, who wished to 'retain' Norway by force, by war. If the Norwegian workers had *not* raised the question of secession *conditionally*, i.e., so that even members of the Social-Democratic Party could conduct propaganda and vote against secession, the Norwegian workers would have failed in their duty as internationalists and would have sunk to narrow, *bourgeois*, Norwegian nationalism. Why ? Because the separation was effected by the bourgeoisie, and not by the proletariat ! Because the Norwegian bourgeoisie, like any other bourgeoisie, *always* strives to drive a wedge between the workers of its own country and the workers of foreign countries ! Because every democratic demand (including self-determination) is, for the class-conscious workers, *subordinated* to the higher interests of socialism. . . . To fail to understand this difference, which is a prerequisite for the 'monistic action' of the International, is on a par with failing to understand why 'monistic action' against the tsarist army, say near Moscow, demands that the revolutionary forces marching from Nizhni should proceed westward, while those from Smolensk should proceed eastward."*

Our comrades of the French Communist Party and of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party have understood that their policy must be determined by the same Marxist-Leninist method, which demands that the concrete circumstances be taken into account. For this reason, in addressing themselves to the bourgeoisie of their countries, they could and had to say to them :

"Gentlemen, you have signed a pact, a limited pact,

**Ibid.*, pp. 291-293.

with the working class of the Soviet Union that has the power in its hands, but you have not signed any pact with the working class of our country, with us. We have no guarantee that you will not utilize your army, which continues to be a class army, against the working class of our country and against the colonial peoples, our allies in the struggle against imperialism. We have no guarantee at all that you will not continue to make the poor, and not the rich, pay the necessary expenses for the organization of your army. We have no control over the manner in which your class government and your reactionary and fascist General Staff will spend the money that you take from the poor in order to pay for the organization of the army. We have not even any guarantee that, when the decisive moment arrives, you will remain loyal to the pact that you are signing today.

"For all these reasons, gentlemen, we can neither vote your military budget nor give up the struggle against your government. But please note that this does not mean that we have no interest in the pact that you have concluded with the Soviet Union or that we are indifferent to the manner in which you give effect to it. We know that in your ranks there are those who are against this pact, that there exists a section of the bourgeoisie who would like to tear it up. We, indeed, will defend the pact with all our strength because it is an instrument in the struggle for peace and for the defense of the Soviet Union. We shall vote for the pact in parliament and we shall expose any attempt to pursue a policy which is different from or in contradiction to the obligations ensuing from the pact."

Those who do not understand the profound inner consistency of this position adopted by our comrades in France and Czechoslovakia will never understand anything of the real dialectics of events and of revolutionary dialectics, even if they fancy themselves to be highly intelligent and logical persons, such as Leon Blum, for instance, fancies himself to be. But our revolutionary dialectics has been understood by the masses, as the comrades of the French Party and of the Czechoslovakian Party have reported to us, and that is quite good enough for us. (*Applause.*)

VII. THE UNITED FRONT IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

COMRADES, in the fight for peace, against imperialist war and in defense of the Soviet Union, our immediate basic political task consists in creating the widest united front of the masses of workers and peasants, and petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals. It is just in this sphere, comrades, in the sphere of the struggle for peace, that our united front policy can score the greatest successes.

It is no accident that during recent years the first important step for overcoming the resistance of the Social-Democratic organizations to the united front was made by the anti-war movement, whose first slogan was proclaimed from the Amsterdam Anti-War Congress by Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse, those inspired champions of the struggle against imperialist war. The Communists have assisted the development of this movement with all their strength, and will continue to do so. But we cannot declare ourselves satisfied, either with the progress which has been made in this field or with the successes of the united front in the anti-war struggle in general. The volume of the united front movement against war is still not in accord with the intensity of war preparations on the part of the capitalists, is still not in accord with the acuteness and gravity of the war danger. All our Sections are faced with the task of doing all that is necessary so that the fight for peace will embrace all those who do not want war, all those who hate war, all those who are ready to fight for peace: Social-Democratic workers, the masses of those with pacifist inclinations, women, children, national minorities that are under the threat of war.

THE POSITION OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The state of confusion and internal collapse in which Social-Democracy finds itself is manifested in a particularly striking way in the attitude of the Social-Democratic Parties to the question of war. The Social-Democratic Parties, which only a few years ago expressed themselves—even if rather

indefinitely—against defense of the fatherland and spoke of certain forms of mass action in case of war, have since begun to pass over more openly to collaboration with the imperialist bourgeoisie in regard to defense of the bourgeois fatherland.

The Swiss, Dutch and Finnish Social-Democratic Parties, for instance, have acted in this way. So have also the British Labour Party and Trade Union Congress. At the same time, the will to struggle against war, for peace and for defense of the Soviet Union, is strengthening among the masses of Social-Democratic workers, and a process of differentiation in connection with the war question is taking place in the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations. In the Left wing of the Socialist Party in France there is developing, although with great vacillations, a tendency towards the position of revolutionary struggle against war, and in particular, to renounce defense of the fatherland under a bourgeois regime. In the Social-Democratic Parties which have been driven into emigration by fascism, there has also been observable tendencies, as yet timid for linking the struggle against war with the struggle for the overthrow of fascism. We cannot but welcome and do everything possible to assist the approach to a revolutionary position on the part of these Left groups of Social-Democracy. And we shall achieve it by entering into a united front with the Social-Democratic workers, while at the same time never refraining from systematically exposing all hesitation and theoretical inaccuracy in regard to this question, which is one of the most complicated and important questions of Marxist-Leninist theory.

At the last plenary meeting of the Executive Committee of the Second International, a resolution on the struggle against war was adopted in which we find a statement concerning the necessity of concentrating fire against German National Socialism and of defending the Soviet Union. This resolution, speaking of the attitude which should be taken up by the working class in case of war, refers to the resolution of the Stuttgart Congress.

We have the right to ask the Social-Democratic leaders: What value has the reference to the Stuttgart resolution, which speaks of utilizing the crisis resulting from war for hastening the overthrow of the class rule of the capitalists, if nothing is done to carry out its directives? In order to carry out the directives of the Stuttgart resolution, it is essential already

today to bring about the unity of action of the working class in the struggle for peace.

If you continue to come out, as heretofore, against the united front, if you hinder it being carried out, then the reference to the Stuttgart decision cannot have any value and is not a guarantee of your position in the future, just as the adoption of the Stuttgart resolution in 1907 was not a guarantee for the Second International against the collapse of August 4, 1914.

THE PACIFIST MOVEMENT

In the pacifist movement we also note a very interesting differentiation. The feeling of horror for the war which the capitalists and fascists are preparing evokes opposition to the war on pacifist grounds among more and more considerable sections. The peace ballot organized in Great Britain by the League of Nations Union and in which eleven million people participated, representing more than half the adult population of the country, is a clear example of the enormous extent of pacifist trends among the masses. The vast majority of those who took part in this ballot not only expressed their hatred for war but their wish that the instigators of war and the aggressors be effectively resisted. We revolutionary workers understand and correctly appreciate the aspirations of the masses who show this pacifist tendency, even if it is still sometimes expressed in a naive and politically false way.

Our place is at the side of these masses, explaining to them what they do not yet understand well, at the same time assisting them in fighting to achieve all that is fundamentally just and human in their strivings for peace. This is all the more necessary because we are not absolutely sure of the path that the pacifist masses will take in future. If they establish connections with the working class and its vanguard, they may form a formidable barrier against war and the instigators of war. If the opposite is the case, the pacifist illusions which still dominate these masses may impel them to a position which will not merely hinder war, but will be used by the instigators of a new imperialist war for their own ends. Do not the German National-Socialist leaders, in their furious campaign for war, have recourse to deceptive "peace" demagoguery? In the pacifist camp is there not a trend nourished partly by people under the spell of pacifist illusions and

partly by counter-revolutionary elements and renegades from Communism, a trend which, under cover of desiring "justice" for Germany also, in reality helps the war propaganda of German fascism?

Therefore, we must penetrate among the pacifist masses, and carry out a big work of enlightenment among them, using forms of organization and action which are adapted to the level of consciousness of these masses and which give them the possibility of taking the first step in the effective struggle against war and capitalism. We must always take two things into account. The first is that the organization of the pacifist masses cannot and must not be a Communist organization; the second is that, in working in this organization, Communists must never give up explaining with the greatest patience and insistence their own point of view on all the problems of the struggle against war.

In this way success can be achieved in emancipating the sincere pacifists from the influence of illusions and mistaken views, and exposing those hypocritical pacifists who by their policy screen the preparation for war. Unfortunately, in many cases it must be admitted that our comrades follow the opposite line to this. On the one hand they attempt to give to the organizations of the pacifist masses the character of a Communist organization and introduce into it inappropriate methods of leadership by the Party. On the other hand, they neglect their obligation to conduct propaganda of our correct Leninist position in the struggle against war. It is necessary to correct both these mistakes.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE IMMEDIATE DEMANDS OF THE MASSES

The struggle for the immediate economic and political demands of the working class, toiling peasantry and all sections of the toiling population must play a primary role in the organization of the united front for the fight for peace. The very preparation for war carried out by the bourgeoisie at the expense of the toilers forces the masses to take up this struggle for their immediate demands.

Note the record figure reached by the war budgets during recent years. This means that the burden of taxation which oppresses the workers, peasants, craftsmen, and small shopkeepers, is continually increasing. The profits of the war

industry are also reaching record figures, while wages are falling more and more, particularly in the countries which are most intensely preparing for war.

The preparation for war, especially in the fascist countries, is accompanied by measures for organization of the whole of war industry and for adapting the entire economy of the country to war needs, and this has an immediate effect on the position of the workers, both from the economic and the political point of view. In Germany, a plan for the reorganization of the whole of industry for war purposes is already in process of operation. The same thing is taking place in Japan. In Italy, the introduction of corporations is nothing but a form of the centralization of industry in case of war.

In the war industry, the workers are already subjected to a war regime and this emphasizes the necessity for specially intense work in this industry.

Unfortunately, we have to record that in this respect a serious defect in the organization of our struggle for peace is to be observed.

The struggle for the immediate demands of the workers, peasants and toiling masses in general is our most effective means for exposing the chauvinist demagogy of fascism, of demonstrating the lying character of the fables propagated by them: the lie about race, about "war in the interests of all," about the "state above classes," about the "proletarian nation which is struggling against capitalist nations," about the "necessity of conquering a place in the sun," etc.

In the course of the struggle for the real interests of the proletariat and toiling masses against exploiters and oppressors, the workers and the whole mass of toilers become educated in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. Hereby the weapon is being forged which in the final analysis will give us the possibility of shattering chauvinist propaganda. But for this to be a really sharp weapon we must undertake the defense not only of the immediate economic interests of the masses, but also of their political demands and aspirations. We must know how to interpret all their interests, we must show that it is precisely the working class and its vanguard that has the task of solving all the problems concerning every section of the toilers in the given country.

I shall not repeat in this connection what has already been said by Comrade Dimitrov concerning the necessity of taking into account and esteeming the revolutionary traditions of the

people, of understanding and supporting their national demands. In our fight against imperialist war, the directive given to all revolutionary workers by Comrade Dimitrov, in his historic report acquires a still greater significance at the present moment when we speak of the tasks of the working class and Communists in the struggle for national liberation and for support of wars for national liberation, when we are confronted by the prospects of a new upsurge of the revolutionary movement of the colonial peoples against imperialism.

WOMEN IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

Another serious defect is the inadequate development of work among women. It must be frankly admitted, with the exception of the Communist Parties of a few countries, we are at the present time devoting less attention than before to work among women. As far as the fight against war is concerned, this is a most serious defect. National-Socialism has forced women back into the situation they were in a century ago. In Germany, and in all other countries, they are directly affected by the frantic preparations for war. The high cost of living, increased taxation and militarization measures affect women in every aspect of their life—as workers, as mothers and as wives. In a number of countries, women have already been directly drawn into war preparations, especially in Germany and Japan. The active participation of women in war, not only in the factories but also in the army service, is being generally provided for. In the war industry the factories are even now drawing in women workers in large numbers, because they are worse paid and more severely exploited. In Germany in 1933, for example, where, in accordance with instructions of the fascist government, 150,000 workers were discharged from the factories, not a single woman worker was discharged from the armament factories; on the contrary, thousands of new women workers were taken on in factories already working for war.

In noting these facts, we must not close our eyes to the tremendous attention which the bourgeoisie and, primarily, the most reactionary parties of the bourgeoisie, are devoting to the organization of women in the most varied ways. It would be absurd to think that this work has not yielded the bourgeoisie any results. Of course, pacifist trends among the masses of women are extremely strong. We know that in the demon-

strations against war, in the protest actions which have been frequently taken in various countries against war and against gas manoeuvres, women have played a most prominent part. But that cannot satisfy us. As against the forms and methods of organizing the masses of women utilized by the bourgeoisie, and particularly by the fascists, we are still not carrying on sufficiently effective work. We are marking time, our work in this sphere is not on a level befitting the tasks of our Parties which alone strive for the complete emancipation of women and also conduct consistent struggle for peace.

In France, we have a very interesting example of the development of a mass movement of women against war and fascism. The large pacifist organizations which have joined this movement contains hundreds of thousands of women belonging to all political tendencies, as well as women not belonging to any party at all. Our participation in this movement was very successful, and we regret that the example of France has not been followed in other countries. Thanks to active participation in this movement, our comrades have found an effective way of establishing contact with those masses of women who until now have stood aloof from all political activity. Even in France, however, not all our comrades correctly understood how Communists should approach such a movement. Our comrades do not always understand that in order to succeed in reaching the masses of women who are still not under our influence just as to succeed in reaching the pacifist masses in general, we must take account of the nature of the organization to which they belong.

We must by no means endeavour to destroy such an organization; on the contrary, we must discover how to collaborate with it in the most varied forms in order to penetrate into its ranks. In some cases, our comrades, instead of understanding and pursuing this correct organizational and political line, replaced broad mass work in the existing organizations by the creation of a narrow and sectarian Communist women's organization. This renders more difficult the creation of a real mass movement of women on behalf of peace and against war.

YOUTH AND THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

The same lagging behind is to be observed in the organization of a united front of the youth in the fight against war. Yet it is just among the youth that the preparation for a new imperialist war makes itself most strongly felt; it is just among

the youth that the bourgeoisie is pushing the preparation for war with particular vigor. It is above all the youth that fascism fascinates by chauvinist and war propaganda. On the other hand, in practically every country the youth have already been seized by the monstrous war machine as a result of measures for militarization.

These measures are today common to all the fascist countries; but they also extend to the democratic countries in a more or less open form. In Germany, all forms of youth organization are connected in one way or another with military training. In Italy, military training begins at the age of eight, and quite recently a new organization for children from six years of age has been formed which also has the aim of militarist and chauvinist propaganda.

These widespread activities of the bourgeoisie in regard to the militarization of the youth must be countered by us with the aid of equally widespread activity aiming at wresting the younger generation from the influence of the bourgeoisie and fascism. In spite of progress in this direction achieved very recently, it must nevertheless be admitted, comrades, that such actions on our part are either still not being conducted at all or are being conducted to an insufficient degree.

A fact we cannot deny is that while many bourgeois trends and parties—from the fascist to the catholic—have succeeded in creating a big organized youth movement, we have not yet succeeded in achieving this aim to the required extent. This is one of the basic weaknesses of our anti-war work. And, naturally, not the least cause of this backwardness is the fact that we have underestimated the influence of the bourgeoisie on the younger generation.

We have contented ourselves with saying, and it is absolutely correct in itself, that the class-consciousness of the masses cannot be lulled and the class struggle cannot be suppressed for long. This, of course, is true. The experience that the younger generation is gaining in the factories and the experience it will gain during a war will inevitably lead to the destruction of the influence of the bourgeoisie and of fascism among the youth. But we cannot and must not wait. We must prevent the youth enrolled in the mass fascist organizations from undergoing the tragic experience that our generations underwent in the World War. We want to have the youth already fighting side by side with us for peace. We must therefore direct and accelerate the process of destroying

the influence of the bourgeoisie among the youth. We must find a way to the younger generation, we must understand their mood and what is in their minds. And if, in order to find the way to this new generation, it is necessary to speak a new language, to cast aside empty formulas, to do away with the old schemes, to change our methods of work and to change the forms of our organization—very well, we shall do so without any hesitation. For this, it is first of all necessary to make a serious, attentive and fundamental study of everything that is going on among the younger generation. I should like to say to the comrades who are directing the work among the youth on a national and international scale that they should more often bear in mind the last words which Lenin addressed to the Young Communist International in his letter to the Third World Congress of that organization :

“I hope that in spite of your *great name* you will not forget the most important thing, the necessity of actively advancing training of the youth and *study*.”

Comrades, you must not remain content with your *great name*. Only by studying and mastering everything that is taking place in the younger generation will you be enabled to accomplish your task. (*Applause*.)

We must not be afraid ; we should go wherever the younger generation is to be found. This means that the forms of organization of the militant united front of the youth in the fight for peace and against war must be extremely flexible, differing in accordance with country and circumstance. In the bourgeois-democratic countries we must follow the example set by our French comrades, who have at last been able to find the way to the youth. We can only welcome and support with all our strength such steps as the calling of the Students' Congress and the recent widespread activity of the World Youth Committee for struggle against war and fascism. In participating in these movements we must be able to play a leading part not by advertising the fact, but by winning the confidence of the youth who will see in us the most ardent champions of their vital interests, the most convinced defenders of all their aspirations.

In the fascist countries, it is absolutely essential to bridge the abyss that in some cases already exists, or which is in process of being created, between the old generation of revo-

lutionary workers and Communists and the younger generation of toilers.

An end must be put once for all to such cases as we have had in Italy, where, for instance, in a large industrial city, among several hundred comrades there is not a single young comrade under twenty years of age, while tens of thousands are enrolled in the fascist organizations, all the more so since experience shows that the youth drawn into the fascist organizations is such that contact with us will rapidly cause it to acquire the ability to be fired with indignation, to protest, and to fight against the fascists. There is only one method of bridging the gap between the old and young generations, namely, to penetrate the fascist organizations, to work within these organizations, to organize a united front and establish our nuclei within the fascist organizations themselves in the forms demanded by the situation. We must go so far as to transform whole sections of fascist youth organizations into points of support for our anti-war work.

We do not want to surrender the youth to fascism. We do not want to allow youth to be turned into shock troops for the warmongers. We want to turn the youth into shock troops for our fight for peace. (Applause).

IX. THE ARMY AND OUR TASKS

COMRADES, the first factor which determines our work in the army at the present moment is that the capitalist armies are more and more assuming a mass character. In the early post-war years the armament race proceeded basically along the line of the improvement of the quality and not of the increase of the quantity of the army. It was during this period that certain bourgeois military theorists developed the theory that war will no more be conducted by mass armies but instead by small professional armies, strongly armed and mechanized. The very development of imperialist rivalry, however, put an end to these attempts of the bourgeoisie to forego mass armies.

Even before 1935, the secret arming of Germany changed the balance of military power and provoked a new armament race. From the beginning of 1935, when the German National-Socialists restored the German army on the basis of compulsory military service, the whole relation of forces in Europe has been upset. The presence in the centre of Europe of a tremen-

dous army, powerfully equipped and mechanized, combined with the frantic aggressive character of German fascism, has intensified the armament race to an unprecedented extent. Fascist Italy, believing itself to be directly menaced by the plans for the annexation of Austria, has carried out a succession of partial mobilizations, as a result of which today nearly a million men are under arms. Great Britain, leading circles of which support German armaments, France and all the other European countries have responded to this provocative arming on the part of Germany by strengthening their armed forces.

On the other hand, technical progress itself causes the armies to take on a mass character, for the more complicated the weapons, the greater is the number of men required for serving the army. Finally, the experience of the war of 1914-18 also demonstrated that the superiority of an army at decisive moments depends to a considerable extent on the number of reserves it possesses. The huge modern armies require just as huge reserves.

This emphasis on the mass character of armies, which is very clearly expressed in the more recent bourgeois laws for the military training and mobilization of the whole population, accentuates the contradiction between the mass character of bourgeois armies and the reactionary aims for which these armies are employed by the bourgeoisie. This contradiction becomes still greater with the growth of fascism. It is precisely on account of this fact that the bourgeoisie, not being in a position to lessen the mass character of its army, resorts to the fascization of the latter so as to prevent the danger of mutinies.

The fascization of the army finds expression in a number of measures, especially in the organization of special propaganda in the army itself.

Never has chauvinist propaganda been conducted amongst the soldiers with such intensity and with such various means. In carrying its propaganda into the army, fascism is trying to convert the army into a point of support for its policy. At the same time, in each of the armies the bourgeoisie increases the number of those elements which it regards as particularly reliable either by reason of the preferential treatment they receive, or in consequence of their constant connection with military organizations (the professional army).

In the German army of 1914 (on the eve of the war) the permanent cadres numbered 143,064 persons, i.e., 18 per

cent of the total army. In the present German army the number of such persons permanently serving in the army is 597,000, i.e., 50.3 per cent of the total army.

In Italy and the other fascist countries, the military-fascist organizations organized for the purpose of civil war are in one form or another points of support for the fascization of the army. The higher command, the officers of the higher ranks, the instructors and certain military-technical sections form the rampart of fascism in the armies of all countries.

In the countries of bourgeois democracy, we must expose this fascization of the army as one of the most dangerous forms of concrete preparation for war. As a counter to this fascization, we must, in our consistent and thoroughgoing struggle for peace, develop our anti-fascist work in the army. We shall not surrender the mass of the soldiers to the fascists. All penetration of fascism into the army is a menace to peace. Every effective measure against such penetration assists the defense of peace.

The fascists are instilling their anti-proletarian, militarist and chauvinist policy into the army. This gives the more justification for the working class in the countries of bourgeois democracy to demand that the army should be democratized by granting the soldiers all political rights. We demand that every soldier should have the right fully to express his opinion regarding the war propaganda that is being conducted in the army by the fascists, that he should have the possibility both inside and outside the army of expressing his desire for peace. We demand that all political rights should be granted to the soldiers because we are certain that an unfettered expression of the desire of the soldiers can hinder the war plans of the bourgeoisie and fascism.

For the same reason we demand that the fascist officers should be expelled from the army and that the reactionary general staffs should be subjected to democratic control, in the exercise of which workers' organizations should participate.

We put forward these demands in order in every possible way to hinder the advance of fascism where it is not yet in power. The very development of our policy of the united front and people's front demands it.

"A revolutionary army and a revolutionary government are two sides of the same medal. They are two institutions equally necessary for the success of the uprising and for the consolidation of its results. They are two

slogans which must be advanced and explained as the only consistent revolutionary slogans.”*

It is impossible to speak seriously of the formation of a government of the united front and people's front in order to bar the way to fascism without at the same time raising the question of transforming the present bourgeois army into a people's army, organized on the basis of closest connection with the people, a reduction of length of service, measures for placing all arms at the disposal of the people and eliminating once for all the reactionary cadres from the army, especially from the higher commanding positions. By all these measures we only desire to destroy one of the supports of fascism and to restrain its war preparations.

At the present moment, therefore, these measures are particularly useful and necessary in those countries of Europe where an attack by German National-Socialism is threatening and where the prospect of a war of national liberation is a real one. In such circumstances the boldest measures for the democratization of the army are absolutely essential. A war of national liberation waged by any small country against German National-Socialism can be victorious only if the army of the country is permeated by a revolutionary spirit.

Our principal task, therefore, is to link the army with the people. Hence we shall fight in defense of all partial demands of the soldiers—those demands which have been the starting point of all movements that have taken place in recent times among the masses of soldiers in bourgeois armies.

In fascist countries, every effort must be made to utilize the slightest opportunities for legal and semi-legal activity, linking the people, and especially the working class, with the mass of the soldiers. We must penetrate into and work within all mass organizations which serve for the militarization of the youth.

In this connection, the theses of the Sixth Congress, which state that Communists must not call upon young workers to join voluntary organizations for military training, must be interpreted in a broad fashion. In the present circumstances, it would be a mistake not to join such organizations in all countries in which they have assumed a mass character. We must enter these organizations, we must work in them.

**Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 317, International Publishers, New York.*

A similar policy in general must be given regarding the organization of defense against air attacks, correcting the mistake of some Communist Parties, which adopted decisions for boycotting defense against air attack. 'We must regard the gas mask as a weapon of war like any other, which the workers must learn to make use of, and in this sphere we should put forward a number of immediate demands for the masses. For instance, we must demand that there should be no difference between the gas masks which the rich are able to buy and those within the reach of the workers' purchasing power. We must demand that the best gas masks should be distributed free of charge among the toiling population. We must protest against the fact that it is only in the houses of the wealthy that gas shelters are being built, and so on. We must combine all our work in this direction with the propaganda and fight against war and for peace.

This new way of regarding our work in the army, as mass work, with a definite, positive content, aiming at the creation of a counterbalance to fascism in the army, is the best preparation for the practical application of the Bolshevik line at the moment when war breaks out; Communists at the moment must not call on the masses to boycott or refuse military service, but must join the army and make it the center of their work. In view of the reality of the menace of war and in view of certain errors which have been committed, for instance, by the Italian Communist Party, we must repeat and stress this Bolshevik standpoint. We are not anarchists. Boycott of mobilization, boycott of the army, sabotage in the factories, refusal of military service, and so on, these are not our methods of fighting war, because they separate us from the masses and can only help the bourgeoisie to strike still more savagely at the Communist vanguard.

X. THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND THE FIGHT FOR REVOLUTION

COMRADES, I am coming to the conclusion of my report. In 1907, at the Stuttgart Congress of the pre-war Second International, a resolution was adopted on the struggle against war. This resolution was passed with an amendment proposed by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, formulated as follows :

"If war should nevertheless break out, it is the duty of the Socialist Parties to work to bring it to an end as speedily as possible and to make every effort to use the economic and political crisis created by the war to weaken the political consciousness of the masses and to hasten the downfall of capitalist domination."

As the continuers of all that was Marxist and revolutionary in the old, pre-war Second International, we bring forward the text of this amendment in the resolution on the struggle against war which we are putting before the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

Nevertheless, one must clearly realize the essential difference that exists between the situation confronting us today and that of the labour movement at the time of the Stuttgart Congress, when this amendment was passed. It is sufficient to point out that in 1907 reformism and centrism were already dominating forces in the old, pre-war Second International, a fact bound to lead to the collapse of August 4, when the leaders of Social-Democracy almost without exception took up the standpoint of defense of the bourgeois fatherland.

Only one party, the Bolshevik Party, endeavoured to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war in order to hasten the downfall of capitalist domination ; it put forward the slogan of converting the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie and waged a consistent struggle for giving effect to this slogan. It is this example of the Bolshevik Party that we shall follow ourselves and which we shall call upon the working class to follow.

But what is the situation at the present day ? The small Bolshevik Party of 1914 has become a great and glorious Party which has the power in its hands in the U.S.S.R., a Party which has become the leading Section of the Communist International. Thanks to the victorious activity of the Bolshevik Party, the

Party of Lenin and Stalin, we witness the growth and strengthening of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, where socialism has irrevocably conquered. The Communist International has its Sections in all the big capitalist countries and in the majority of the colonial countries. Among the Sections of the Communist International is the Chinese Communist Party, which holds power on a territory with a population of 100,000,000. In the course of 16 years of struggle against the bourgeoisie, against Social-Democracy, against Right and "Left" opportunism, all the Sections of the Communist International have become steeled. The Seventh Congress gives an example of the unparalleled ideological consolidation of our International. In some countries, our Sections are already on the way to becoming transformed into real, Bolshevik mass Parties.

The teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the struggle against imperialist war has not only been thoroughly studied throughout the international Communist movement, but it has already on a number of occasions found practical application in the post-war years. During the wars which have taken place during these years, many of our Parties have stood the test of battle. The struggle conducted by our French and German comrades during the occupation of the Ruhr, the heroic activity of our Japanese Party during the Japanese seizure of Manchuria and the attack on Shanghai, are examples which we can proudly show to the working class. Finally, our Chinese Party has shown its ability not only to struggle against war but to organize and conduct a revolutionary war under the most difficult conditions. (*Applause.*)

Can we assert, on the basis of this experience, that there will be no waverings or mistakes in our ranks if war breaks out? It would be imprudent to draw such a conclusion, because we know that the moment when war breaks out is the moment when the bourgeoisie will strive to exert its greatest influence on the working class and when the Communist vanguard will encounter a number of great difficulties. That which we can assert is that, in contradistinction to 1914, there will be in all countries not a few isolated comrades, but a solid and disciplined vanguard which will remain loyal to the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and which will undertake with all its power to apply these teachings in practice by following the example of the Russian Bolsheviks.

This is a major fact, the importance of which the bourgeoisie will very soon understand.

But today, on the eve of the second cycle of revolutions and wars, the situation of the bourgeoisie itself differs profoundly from that of 1914. The power of the ruling classes was then still so firm that the bourgeoisie was able to govern everywhere according to the methods of parliamentary democracy. Today, the capitalist world is so shaken by the decades of the general crisis and by the years of the world economic crisis that very great instability prevails in all the capitalist states. The fascist dictatorships to which the bourgeoisie has resorted to consolidate its power, intensify all the contradictions of capitalism and sharpen the class struggle in all countries to the highest degree. War may break out at a time when the discontent of the masses with the capitalist regime is becoming general and is extending widely among the middle strata ; at a time when "the idea of storming capitalism is maturing in the minds of the masses," at a time when the example of the U.S.S.R. is raising the evergrowing prestige of socialism to unprecedented heights. In Asia, Africa, South America, the revolt of the colonial peoples already makes itself heard.

But what will the new war be like ? Army officers, men of science and novelists have tried to depict the horrors of mechanized war, of chemical and bacteriological war. But we refrain from making any predictions because the most sensational discoveries are being kept secret and because it is difficult to conceive the degree of barbarity which the bourgeoisie are capable of reaching. The "small" wars which have been fought during recent years in South America between the vassal states of Great Britain and the United States afford a terrible example in this matter. Paraguay, which has a population of a million, had fifty thousand killed ; Bolivia, with three and a half million inhabitants, had seventy thousand killed ; terrible figures compared with the corresponding losses of the big capitalist states during the World War. The war of these little countries was stopped because its horrors were so great that the whole population rose in revolt to put an end to it. And this was only a "small" war !

We cannot foresee what will take place when the most perfected means of destruction are put into operation on a mass scale. We know only that the next war will be a general war of all countries, a war in which there will be no distinction between front and rear, a war of destruction of every-

thing which makes the life of a present-day cultured nation possible. The next war will be a war against the workers, against women and children ; it will be a war of extermination. It will be a fascist war.

The last war lasted two or three years before there were cases of mass revolts of the soldiers at the front and of the population in the rear. Messieurs the bourgeoisie must not blame us if this time the interval will be much shorter and we realize that we shall be performing the greatest service to the whole of humanity by making it as short as possible. The most objective examination of the international situation and the mass movement, and of their perspectives, inevitably brings us to the conclusion that for all capitalist countries the beginning of the war will denote the onset of a revolutionary crisis, and during this crisis we shall fight with all our strength at the head of the masses to convert the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie, we shall fight for revolution and for the conquest of power. (*Applause.*)

But this prospect, comrades, does not mean that we shall have an easy task.

"The victory of revolution never comes by itself. It has to be prepared for and won. And only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare for and win victory."*

These words of Comrade Stalin, the leader of the international proletariat, acquire a deep significance, especially just now when we speak of our tasks in case of the outbreak of a new world war.

The difficulties which we encounter at present in our work will be but a trifle compared with those which will confront us when we shall have to fight against the bourgeoisie under war conditions.

"War is inevitably bound to awaken the most violent feelings among the masses which lead people to come out of their ordinary lethargy. If there is no correspondence between these new, sharp and violent feelings, revolutionary tactics are impossible." So Lenin wrote in 1915. All the revolutionary parties, except the Bolshevik Party, proved bankrupt before

*Stalin, "Report of the Work of the Central Committee to the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.," see *Socialism Victorious*, p. 16, International Publishers, New York.

the task of leading the masses at a moment of extreme tension of all feelings and all class relations.

What came out of the huge revolt of French soldiers after the massacre of Chemin des Dames? What came out of the defeat and collapse of the Italian army at Caporetto in 1917? The defeat of the bourgeoisie and even the disintegration of the bourgeois army do not yet mean the victory of the revolution. The Bolsheviks were able to convert the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the disintegration of the tsarist army into the victory of the revolution only because they were connected with the masses of the soldiers and the masses of the people, because they had a political line which expressed the most profound aspirations of these masses.

Only the Bolsheviks proved capable of fulfilling the task of leading the masses at the moment of extreme accentuation of all class contradictions.

And here I would like to return to the question with which I started. During the last century, approximately up to the 'nineties, when the workers' movement was led directly by Marx and Engels, the working class had to take up its position on the problem of war under conditions when the bourgeoisie in a number of countries was still playing a progressive role connected with the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Marx and Engels took these conditions into account in each separate case in determining their attitude to a particular war.

When the period of imperialism began, this progressive role of the bourgeoisie disappeared, and the wars of the bourgeoisie changed their character and became imperialist wars. Those who have not understood this transformation have committed serious mistakes and crimes towards the working class.

The existence of the Soviet Union is a new factor of world-historical significance which introduces radical modifications in the character of the entire period of development through which we are passing. All our tactics in case of war must be determined by taking this factor into consideration. Already, in the theses of the Sixth World Congress it was laid down that in case of war against the Soviet Union, the slogan of fraternization must give place to the slogan of deserting to the side of the Red Army. In the theses of the Sixth World Congress it is stated that in case of an imperialist war against the Soviet Union

"....the tactics and choice of the means of struggle [of the proletariat] must be determined not only by the interests of the class struggle in their own country, but by the interests of the war at the front, which is a class war of the bourgeoisie against the proletarian state."

In the resolution which we are putting before our Seventh Congress, we make these instructions still more precise by declaring that *in case of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union, the Communists must call on all the toilers to help by all means and at any cost to bring about the victory of the Red Army against the imperialist armies.* (Applause.)

I think that this line is sufficiently clear; it corresponds to the feelings of millions of toilers. And if someone asks us what is the meaning of this line and how we shall act in the various concrete cases of war that may possibly arrive, we have only one reply to give: In each case we shall act as Marxists, as Bolsheviks; in other words, we shall begin by an exact appraisal of the concrete situation, of the character of the war which is about to be fought, of the relations of class forces at each given moment, of the extent of our forces and the forces of our adversaries, and on the basis of an exact estimate of the position we shall decide our immediate perspectives and the concrete forms of our work. We shall never lose sight of the fact that one of the chief qualities of a Bolshevik is that of being able to unite the greatest loyalty to principles with the greatest capacity of manoeuvring and the greatest flexibility.

Look at the example given by our comrades of the Chinese Red Army. Forced by the attack of the reactionary troops into a situation which seemed hopeless, they succeeded, by temporarily abandoning the provinces which they could no longer hold, in shifting the struggle to other districts and in winning as a result still greater and more solid positions than those which they previously possessed. In this heroic 3,000 kilometer march of the Chinese Red Army through the provinces of Central China, what is remarkable is not only the heroism of its participants but also their outstanding political maturity and the flexibility of their manoeuvres. (Applause.) Only a party educated in a Bolshevik spirit could conceive and carry through such a truly Leninist manoeuvre. May all our Parties be able to show the same Bolshevik qualities in time of war. May all our Parties henceforth work to acquire them. It is from this angle of vision that they should analyze

their weaknesses and subject them to criticism.

I would like to say, for instance, to the comrades of the Communist Party of Germany: "Are you sufficiently connected with the masses of young toilers whom German fascism is on the point of converting into cannon-fodder?" No, you are not yet sufficiently connected with these masses of the youth, nor with the workers of your war factories, nor with the peasants of your villages; you are not able to feel sure that when war breaks out, these masses will take the path of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, which you are pointing out to them. You will have to carry out a great and difficult, truly Bolshevik, work to wrest these masses from the influence of chauvinism.

I want to say to our Spanish comrades: We have praised you for the heroism of your fighters at the barricades. But perhaps you would have performed a greater service to all the Parties of the Communist International and to our Congress, you who have passed so recently through the fire of civil war, if you had severely criticized the conduct of your organizations during the days of street fighting. You would, perhaps, have arrived at the conclusion that your organizations as such were not equal to the height of the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the art of insurrection, that they did not understand that it was not a question merely of dying like heroes at the barricades but of leading the fight of the masses as a whole, of never losing the initiative and of being able to wrest the leadership from the hands of wavering elements who could only surrender at the first difficulties. If you had subjected your action during the street battles to a severe criticism, you would have given great help to the comrades of other countries in understanding how great is the difficulty of the task of converting imperialist war into civil war against the bourgeoisie, how great is the difficulty of carrying out the tasks facing the Communist Party during civil war. (*Applause.*)

I would also like to say to our comrades of the French Communist Party: You have been able with your courageous tactical turn to raise high our banner in your country. This imposes on you a great obligation, not only before us but before the masses. The class struggle goes forward. It is necessary to be equal to the tasks which history imposes on us. In case of war these tasks will be extremely difficult, extremely complicated for you. You possess revolutionary traditions, such as the example of the Jacobins of 1793, of Robespierre

and Carnot, who were able simultaneously to carry on civil war within the country and to beat back the attack of reaction at the frontiers. You have the revolutionary tradition of the Paris Commune, which was able to raise high the flag of the defense of the country and which transformed it into a banner of defense of the revolution. But, in taking the path traced out by the Commune, we do not want to be defeated again, we want to conquer! For this it is necessary to have the support of the masses of workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie, of the entire people of France. We must have a steel leadership, a truly Leninist-Stalinist Party, equal to its great historical task.

I would like to say to all the comrades of all the Communist Parties represented here :

War will be a very complicated political matter, but at the same time it will be a very simple and concrete matter as far as it concerns the conditions in which we shall have to work and fight. Enthusiasm alone will not avail. There will, perhaps, even be no written resolutions. There will be the factory and the trenches, where it will be necessary to decide without waverings the most difficult problems, because all wavering will cost us dear. It is therefore necessary from today for us to educate all our Parties, all organizations, all cadres, every Party member, in the spirit of maximum initiative and personal responsibility. This can only be attained as the result of the widest ideological preparation and the closest contact with the masses.

Today we are a great army which is fighting for peace. We cannot foresee and no one can foresee how long our struggle for peace can continue. It may be a year, it may be more, it may be only a few months. We must be ready at any moment.

Our Congress has traced out a Leninist line of action ; this is already a first guarantee of victory. We have a great force, the Bolshevik Party. We have a leader, Comrade Stalin (*applause*), of whom we know that he has always, in the most difficult moments, found the line which has led to victory ; our leader, Comrade Stalin, who, during the years of civil war, was sent by Lenin to all the fronts where victory seemed to be escaping the toilers of the U.S.S.R. And everywhere, from Perm to Tsaritsin, from Petrograd to the Southern front, Stalin re-established the position, defeated the enemy, and assured victory. (*Applause.*)

The World Party of the Bolsheviks and of Stalin is the guarantee of our victory on a world scale. Let us close our ranks, comrades, in the fight against imperialist war, for peace, for the defense of the Soviet Union.

Raise high the banner of proletarian internationalism, the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin!

Long live the triumph of the revolution and of socialism throughout the world!

(Prolonged, stormy applause. The delegates stand and greet Comrade Ercoli. The "Internationale" is sung. All the delegations shout their greetings. Cries of "hurrah!" A prolonged ovation.)

SPEECH IN REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION

(The delegates stand and greet the appearance of Comrade Ercoli on the platform; they give him an ovation and sing the "Internationale.")

COMRADES, the very character of the discussion on the danger of a new imperialist war and on the Communist International's fight against this danger makes it possible for me to limit my reply to the discussion to a minimum.

In point of fact, all the representatives of the revolutionary movement of the entire capitalist world and the colonial countries who have spoken in the discussion have declared their full agreement with the line of my report and with the analysis of how the danger of a new imperialist war is maturing, and how the bourgeoisie, and especially the most reactionary parties of the bourgeoisie—German National-Socialism, the Japanese militarists, Italian fascism, the extreme war parties of the bourgeoisie throughout the world—are preparing a new imperialist war.

All the comrades have shown by their speeches that they are in full agreement with the fundamental point of my report; I have in mind that close connection which exists at the present between our fight for peace and against imperialist war and our fight against fascism.

At the present moment the danger of war threatens concretely from three sides: from German National-Socialism, from imperialist Japan and from Italian fascism. These are

the most reactionary states ; they are states that have either abolished the regime of bourgeois democracy or that have never possessed it, states striving for war, desiring war, already waging war.

Capitalist reaction is war ; fascism is war. This is what actual reality demonstrates to us now.

By concentrating the forces of the Communist vanguard of the working class against fascism, we create the necessary conditions for the success of our fight against war and for peace.

Comrade Dimitrov, in his historic report made to our Congress, pointed out for the Communist International and the world proletariat the line of effective struggle against fascism as also the basic line of our fight against war and for peace.

One of the defects of the discussion was that the speeches of all those taking part bore, perhaps, too much of a general character, that it was not shown concretely in the speeches what must be the nature of our struggle against war at the present time.

At the present day we are already face to face with war. Japan is waging war against China ; nevertheless, the majority of the Communist Parties still neglect the tasks of the fight for the defense of the Chinese Revolution.

Some comrades, by the way, put forward in the discussion a special question of a tactical character. This is the question of our attitude to gas-mask exercises which are being carried on now in all capitalist countries, and in which workers, as well as the whole civil population in general, are being compelled to participate.

We must decide this question in accordance with our general line in the struggle against war. I said, and I repeat, that we must not take the standpoint of boycotting gas-mask exercises in general. That would surely be a deviation on the side of narrow, sectarian and even anarchistic anti-militarism, which could only bar our way to establishing connections with the wide masses.

Gas masks are just as much a weapon as any other. The gas mask is a weapon of a defensive character ; it can be employed during civil war since poison gases belong to the type of weapons which the bourgeoisie make use of in the struggle against the working class for dispersing demonstrations, and during strikes. And we must know how to defend our-

selves from this barbarous weapon of the bourgeoisie.

It would also be incorrect to justify the attitude of boycott by the argument that gas masks are of no use. Such an assertion only facilitates the spreading of the untrue opinion that the development of military-technical resources has now reached such a level as to make defense, and therefore war too, impossible. There are pacifists who adhere to this mistaken point of view, but we must firmly stand by our own.

Workers who are threatened by gas attacks in any war, including civil war, are entitled to ask us: why should we not prepare ourselves for this war also?

Utilizing the gas-mask exercises conducted by the bourgeoisie, we must put forward a number of immediate demands which would link us with the masses and develop the struggle of the masses for peace and against war.

The more important and more general question of the prospect of a war of national defense in Europe, and of the position of the proletariat in such a case, was raised in the speech of Comrade de Leov. The prospect of a war of national liberation concerns not only the Dutch Party but also a number of other Parties, and we must welcome as a sign of political maturity the fact that the representatives of all the Parties concerned adopted a correct Marxian position on this question.

The prospect of the possibility of national wars in Europe even in the period of imperialism was put forward by Lenin as early as 1916 in his polemic with Rosa Luxemburg on the question of her pamphlet published under the pseudonym of Junius. Rosa Luxemburg denied the possibility of national wars because the world was completely divided up between several imperialist "big" powers; from which it follows, she maintained, that every war, even if at the beginning it has a national character, becomes an imperialist war in as much as it inevitably touches on the interests of one of the imperialist powers or imperialist coalitions. Answering Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin pointed out that from the purely theoretical point of view it was impossible to deny the hypothesis of the conversion even of the World War of 1914 into a national war. Then, reviewing the problem of the concrete possibility of national wars in Europe, Lenin pointed out that such wars would be possible especially in the case of the victory of the revolution in Russia and of the extreme exhaustion of the forces of the big powers in the war of 1914, and that national wars against the imperialist powers are, in this case, not only possible and

probable but are inevitable and will have a progressive, revolutionary character.

The situation which we are facing at the present time has much in common with that which Lenin foresaw as early as 1916.

The victory of the revolution in Russia is a fact; the extreme weakening of the big imperialist powers after the war is also a fact; but in addition we have also fascism, German National-Socialism, which threatens with its bayonets the freedom and national independence of a number of small peoples in Europe. Hence, we must not only confirm the prospect outlined by Lenin in 1916, but also emphasize the tasks which arise before our Parties in as much as this prospect becomes real.

In the theses of the Sixth World Congress it is emphasized that participation in a national-liberation war and support of it signifies that the proletariat, in supporting such a war, undertakes "temporary co-operation with the bourgeoisie." But this temporary co-operation must never lead to renouncing the class struggle, i.e., it cannot and must not ever be a reformist co-operation. It is the more necessary to stress this because the bourgeoisie, as we know, even if it is compelled at a given moment to take up arms in defense of national independence and freedom, is always ready to go over to the camp of the adversary in face of the danger of the war being converted into a people's war and of a mighty upsurge of the masses of workers and peasants demanding the satisfaction of their class demands.

By defending the national freedom of small countries, threatened by imperialist aggression, we shall defend everything that is progressive in the national sentiment of the small peoples struggling for their independence, but we shall decisively refuse to undertake defense of the reactionary policy of the bourgeoisie. No other policy of defending the national independence of the small peoples is possible. * In Europe there exist such small countries as Holland and Belgium whose national independence is clearly menaced by a predatory and interventionist war of German National-Socialism. At the same time, the bourgeoisie of these countries oppresses an extensive colonial empire. There is not the slightest doubt that in these countries our policy of defense of national freedom must never be separated from real struggle for the liberation of the oppressed and exploited peoples of the colonies. "A

people that wishes to be free may not make other peoples its slaves." Guided by these words of Marx, we prove by our wholehearted struggle for the widest application of the principle of national self-determination in all countries that the working class is the sole progressive force on which to base a policy of active counteraction to the fascist tyranny threatening all nations.

The questions raised by the British and Dutch comrades are in themselves important, big questions, but they are partial, concrete questions of our tactics.

Finally, it is essential to emphasize the factor that at the present time is at the centre of the problems of the fight against war and is directly connected with the perspective that we, in fighting for peace, put forward not only before ourselves but before the working class and toilers of the whole world.

We have analyzed the new features of the international situation. We have singled out the most important of them. We must emphasize with all our force that the review of these factors in their totality leads us to the conclusion that our fight for peace is not only necessary but that at the present time it has also such chances of success as never previously existed.

In affirming this, we do not by any means change our Marxist point of view in the question of war. We know and confirm that war is a requirement of the capitalist regime, that capitalism cannot develop without enveloping the peoples in the horrors of war.

There have been certain so-called "Marxists" who attempted to slur over or to revise this position, asserting that capitalism could "organize" and develop along a peaceful path. All these opportunist theories of the possibility of a peaceful "organized" development of capitalism have long ago suffered shipwreck. On the other hand, however, as we know, there were and still exist tendencies to take up a fatalist position. This position is a consequence of the distortion of the exact meaning of the Marxian assertion of the impossibility of separating war from the capitalist regime.

This fatalist point of view leads to the fight for peace being considered impossible, devoid of all prospects, a hopeless fight which has no chance of success as long as the capitalist regime exists.

The consequence of this false position was also that narrow sectarian character, confined within the limits of propaganda

alone, which stamped the anti-war struggle of our Parties throughout a long period.

They limited themselves to propaganda against war solely within the ranks of the vanguard of the working class, starting out from the point of view that only this vanguard could be convinced of the inevitability of war under the capitalist regime. This led to the loss of connections with the widest masses which, on entering into the struggle, desire to have before them a prospect of a successful outcome of this struggle. Under these conditions, our fight against war could not have the requisite success. Taking into account the whole totality of the new features which characterize the present situation, we must correct these mistakes.

What are these new features ?

1. The existence of the Soviet Union—of a country in which the working class, being in possession of power, uses this power for defense of peace and for preservation of peace, both in the interests of the building of socialism in the Soviet Union and in the interests of the toiling masses of the whole world, in the interests of civilization and the progress of humanity.

This point of support, of tremendous significance in our struggle for peace, gives this struggle a prospect of success such as never previously existed.

2. Profound forces of the working class have come into movement ; in an ever widening front they are coming out against the capitalist regime, fighting for their urgent demands, fighting against fascism. They are striving for the unification of their forces in this fight. This impulse of the masses towards unity in the fight against fascism, which is at the same time an urge towards unity in the fight against war, is now compelling even the leaders of the Second International to revise their position.

In a few days the Executive Committee of the Second International will meet in Brussels and will once again discuss a solution of the problems that confront us, the question of what position ought to be adopted by the working class in the fight against war.

All that remains for us is to express the hope that at this session of the Executive Committee persons will be found who will be able to reflect the ever-strengthening desire of the masses of Social-Democratic workers for struggle for peace,

and who will be able to give real expression to this desire for struggle, not only by framing new resolutions on this question, but also by drawing all the necessary conclusions so that the warmongers will be opposed by a mighty united front of struggle not only of the workers but also of the widest masses of toilers.

3. Hatred of imperialist war is growing not only among the masses of workers, but also among the masses of the petty bourgeoisie, among the intellectuals. Never was hatred of war so deep and powerful as now.

Consequently, the possibility exists of drawing into the fight for peace those strata that up to now have not participated in political fights and that constitute a considerable force capable of coming out against the instigator of war—fascism.

4. Finally, we have shown that at the present time deep divergences exist within the front itself of the imperialists. Alongside the capitalist states that are the chief instigators of war, there exist also bourgeois states that are interested in the preservation of peace, and small countries that desire to defend peace because they have every ground for fearing an attack on their independence on the part of German National-Socialism.

In virtue of all these causes, a new situation is taking shape before the working class. The front of struggle against war and for peace can now be organized not only as a front of the vanguard of the working class struggling for the overthrow of the capitalist regime. We can now draw new forces into this front. This front includes, on the one hand, the whole mass of toilers of the state in which power is in the hands of the proletariat. This state gives the masses a magnificent example of how to fight for peace and to preserve it. For that reason it has an army that stands for defense of peace. On the other hand, we must draw into the front of the fight for peace the working class of all countries where power is still in the hands of the capitalists.

We can draw into the front of struggle for peace the masses of Social-Democratic toilers and wide masses of pacifists, Catholics, women, youth, national minorities that find themselves menaced, and their organizations. We can draw into the ranks of this front even those bourgeois governments which at the present moment are interested in the preservation of peace.

Under such circumstances, we must in concluding the

discussion on this point of the agenda of our Congress boldly put forward the following perspective: that it is not only possible to postpone war but that it is possible also to prevent the outburst of a new imperialist war. *

But for this prospect to become real, our whole fight against war must take on a character profoundly different from that which it previously possessed.

We must break through the narrow bounds of the former anti-war and anti-militarist work, we must give our fight for peace the widest character, as far as possible embracing the whole of the people.

Take the peace ballot held in England which mobilized eleven million persons. Here is an example which our comrades should follow, here is an initiative which the British comrades should have taken into their own hands in order to put themselves at the head of the masses of people desirous of defending peace.

Of course, comrades, we have to deal with a monstrous enemy, with fascism, that holds power in its hands in a number of countries and utilizes this power in order to make propaganda for war, to prepare it and wage it. But we know, Comrade Dimitrov showed us, and all actual reality is a witness of it for us, that the power of fascism is unstable, undermined by very deep internal contradictions, and by no means guaranteed against the outburst of class struggle.

If the German working class, led by its Communist Party, on uniting its forces and putting itself at the head of all the anti-fascist forces of the country, could deliver a mortal blow to the National-Socialist regime, only think, comrades, what colossal consequences this fact would have for the entire international situation.

From the point of view of the prospects of war this would radically change the situation for the working class of the whole world. It would open up a new path and "new possibilities for our fight for peace.

Hence a very great responsibility before the toilers of the whole world is borne by the comrades of those Parties that are struggling in the countries of fascist dictatorship, in the first place, our German, Italian and Japanese comrades. Every success of their struggle opens up new prospects for our fight for peace.

No less responsibility falls on the Communist Parties of all the other countries. They have the obligation to implant the following conviction deeply into the masses: the fight for peace has chances of success if only all enemies of war, all friends of peace, forces of the working class, forces of the wide masses of the petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals, threatened national minorities, and the states themselves that are interested at the present moment in the preservation of peace, join together and oppose a mighty front against the instigators and inciters of war.

In giving this new scope to our fight for peace and opening up such a prospect of success and victory for it, we do not in the slightest degree alter our Marxist position on the questions of war and peace.

We know that in the struggle between the war parties and the forces of peace, the very fate of the capitalist regime is at stake.

To avoid war, to preserve peace for as long as possible—means at the same time to act in the interests of the cause of socialism. Under conditions of peace, the forces of socialism, which are the forces of progress, are consolidated and advance onwards.

We shall convey to the whole world our profound conviction that the preservation of peace is possible, that it is possible to hinder war, that under definite conditions to avoid war is a thing that is possible and realizable. On the basis of this conviction we shall gather around us millions of persons for the struggle for the great, most just and most socialist cause—the cause of peace.

The Bolshevik Party, led by our Comrade Stalin, which is the most consistent revolutionary Party of all parties that have ever existed, gives us an example of consistent struggle for peace conducted under the most difficult conditions and nevertheless crowned with success.

May the fight of the whole Communist International for peace develop with the same consistency, with the same courage, with the same determination and with the same enthusiasm—then it also will be crowned with the same success!

Our banner is the banner of the fight for peace. We shall raise this banner before the millions of toilers of the whole world! We shall defend it from the fascists, from all the war-

mongers ! Herein lies for us the most certain guarantee that the millions of toilers will tomorrow follow us to the struggle for revolution and socialism !

(Prolonged applause, developing into an ovation ; the delegates stand and sing " Bandiera Rossa. ")

FIGHT FOR PEACE AND AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

(Resolution on the Report of M. Ercoli, Adopted August 20, by the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.)

I. THE PREPARATION OF WAR FOR A NEW REPARTITION OF THE WORLD

The world economic crisis and the shattering of capitalist stabilization have given rise to the extreme instability of all international relations. The intensified struggle on the world market, which has shrunk extremely as a result of the economic crisis, has passed into fierce economic war. *A new repartition of the world has actually already begun.*

Japanese Imperialism, waging war in the Far East, has already made a start toward a new repartition of the world. The military occupation of Manchuria and North China signifies the virtual annulment of the *Washington Treaties* which regulated the division of the spheres of influence among the imperialist powers in China and their mutual relations in the Pacific. Japan's predatory expedition is already leading to the weakening of the influence of British and American imperialism in China, is menacing the position of Great Britain and the U.S.A. in the Pacific and is a preparation for a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

All that is left of the *Versailles Treaty* is state frontiers and the distribution of mandates for colonies. The liquidation of the Versailles Treaty took place as a result of the stoppage of reparation payments, the re-establishment of universal conscription by the Hitler government, and also by the conclusion of a naval agreement between Britain and Germany.

Being the chief instigators of war, the German Fascists, who strive for the hegemony of German imperialism in Europe,

raise the question of changing the boundaries of Europe at the expense of their neighbours by means of war. The adventurist plans of the German fascists are very far-reaching and count on a war of revenge against France, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, annexation of Austria, destruction of the independence of the Baltic States, which they are striving to convert into a base for attack on the Soviet Union, and the wresting of the Soviet Ukraine from the U.S.S.R. They are demanding colonies and are endeavouring to arouse moods in favour of a world war for a new repartition of the world. All these intrigues of the reckless inciters of war help to intensify the contradictions between the capitalist states and create disturbances throughout Europe.

German imperialism has found an ally in Europe—*Fascist Poland*, which is also striving to extend its territory at the expense of Czechoslovakia, the Baltic countries and the Soviet Union.

The dominant circles of the *British bourgeoisie* support the German armaments in order to weaken the hegemony of France on the European continent, to turn the spearhead of German armaments from the West to the East and to direct Germany's aggressiveness against the Soviet Union. By this policy Great Britain is striving to set up a counterbalance to the United States on a world-wide scale and, simultaneously, to strengthen the anti-Soviet tendencies not only of Germany but also of Japan and Poland. This policy of British imperialism is one of the factors accelerating the outbreak of a world imperialist war.

Italian Imperialism is directly proceeding to the seizure of Abyssinia, thus creating new tension in the relations between the great imperialist Powers.

The main contradiction in the camp of the imperialists is the Anglo-American antagonism which exerts its influence on all the contradictions in world politics. In South America, where the hostile interests of Great Britain and the United States clash most sharply, this antagonism led to wars between the respective South American vassals of these Powers (between Bolivia and Paraguay, Colombia and Peru), and threatens further armed conflicts in South and Central America (Colombia and Venezuela.)

At a time when particularly the fascist states—Germany, Poland, Hungary, Italy—are openly striving for a new repartition of the world and a change in the frontiers of Europe.

there is a tendency among a number of other countries to maintain the *status quo*. At the present time this tendency is represented on a world scale by the United States; in Europe, primarily by France; the efforts of these two leading imperialist powers to maintain the *status quo* are supported by several smaller countries (the Little and Balkan Ententes, some of the Baltic states) whose independence is threatened by a new imperialist war.

The victory of German National-Socialism, the most reactionary, the most aggressive form of fascism, and its war provocations have spurred on the war parties, which represent the most reactionary and chauvinist elements of the bourgeoisie, in all countries to fight more vigorously for power and to intensify the fascization of the state apparatus.

The frantic arming of fascist Germany, especially the restoration of military conscription and the enormous increase of the navy and air fleet in Germany, have given rise to a new, intensified race for *armaments* throughout the capitalist world. Despite the world economic crisis, the war industry flourishes more than ever before. The countries which have gone furthest in preparing for war (Germany, Japan, Italy, Poland) have already placed their national economy on a war footing. Alongside the regular armies, special detachments are trained to safeguard the rear and to do gendarme service at the front. Pre-conscription training is widespread in all capitalist countries, and even includes juveniles. *Education* and *propaganda* in the spirit of chauvinism and racial demagoguery are encouraged in every way, their cost being defrayed by the government.

Although the acuteness of the imperialist contradictions renders the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc difficult at the present moment, the fascist governments and war parties in the capitalist countries endeavour to solve these contradictions at the expense of the fatherland of all the toilers, at the expense of the Soviet Union. The danger of the outbreak of a new imperialist war daily threatens humanity.

II. ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

On the basis of the rapid rise of socialist industry and agriculture, on the basis of the liquidation of the last capitalist class—the kulaks, on the basis of the final victory of socialism over capitalism and the strengthening of the defensive power of the country resulting therefrom, *the mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries have entered a new phase.*

The basic contradiction, that between the socialist and the capitalist world, has become still more acute. But due to its growing might, the Soviet Union has been able to avert the attack that was already prepared by the imperialist powers and their vassals, and to unfold its consistent policy of peace directed against all instigators of war. This has made the Soviet Union the centre of attraction not only for class-conscious workers, but for all the toiling people in the capitalist and colonial countries who strive for peace. Moreover, the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. has not only upset the plans of the imperialists to isolate the Soviet Union, but has laid the basis for its co-operation in the cause of the preservation of peace *with the small states* for whom war, by placing their independence in jeopardy, represents a special danger, as well as with those Governments which at the *present moment* are interested in the preservation of peace.

The peace policy of the U.S.S.R., putting forward proletarian internationalism as against national and racial dissension, is not only directed towards defense of the Soviet country, towards ensuring the safety of socialist construction, it also protects the lives of the workers of all countries, the lives of all the oppressed and exploited, it means the defense of the national independence of small nations, it serves the vital interests of humanity, it defends culture from the barbarities of war.

At the time when a new war between the imperialist states is approaching ever more closely, the might of the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army of the U.S.S.R. is constantly gaining in importance in the struggle for peace. Under the circumstances of a frantic increase in armaments by the imperialist countries, especially on the part of Germany, Japan and Poland all those who are striving to preserve peace are vitally interested in strengthening and actively supporting the Red Army.

III. THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

On the basis of the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin on war, the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International concretely formulated the tasks of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary proletariat in the struggle against imperialist war. Guided by these principles, the Communist Parties of Japan and China, both directly affected by war, have waged and are waging a Bolshevik struggle against imperialist war and for the defence of the Chinese people. *The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, confirming the decision of the Sixth Congress on the struggle against imperialist war*, sets the following main tasks before the Communist Parties, revolutionary workers, toilers, peasants and oppressed peoples of the whole world:

1. *The struggle for peace, and for the defence of the U.S.S.R.* In face of the war provocations of the German fascists and Japanese militarists, and the speeding up of armaments by the war parties in the capitalist countries, in face of the immediate danger of a counter-revolutionary war breaking out against the Soviet Union the *central slogan* of the Communist Parties must: *Struggle for peace.*

2. *The united people's front in the struggle for peace and against the instigators of war.* The struggle for peace opens up before the Communist Parties the greatest opportunities for creating the broadest united front. All those interested in the preservation of peace should be drawn into this united front. The concentration of forces against the chief instigators of war at any given moment (at the present time—against fascist Germany, and against Poland and Japan which are in league with it) constitutes a most important tactical task of the Communist Parties. It is of especially great importance for the Communist Party of Germany to expose the national demagoguery of Hitler fascism, which screens itself behind phrases about the unification of the German people but in fact leads to the isolation of the German people and to a new war catastrophe. The indispensable condition and prerequisite for the unification of the German people lies in the overthrow of Hitler fascism. The establishment of a united front with Social-Democratic and reformist organizations (party, trade unions, cooperative, sport, and cultural and educational organizations)

and with the bulk of their members, as well as with mass national-liberation, religious-democratic and pacifist organizations and their adherents, is of decisive importance for the struggle against war and its fascist instigators in all countries.

The formation of a united front with *Social Democratic and Reformist Organisations* for the struggle for peace necessitates a determined ideological struggle against reactionary elements within the Social Democratic Parties which, in face of the immediate danger of war, proceed to collaborate even more closely with the bourgeoisie for the defence of the bourgeois fatherland and by their campaigns of slander against the Soviet Union directly aid the preparations for an anti-Soviet war. It necessitates close collaboration with those forces in the Social-Democratic Parties, reformist Trade Unions and other mass labour organizations whose position is approaching ever closer to that of revolutionary struggle against imperialist war.

The drawing of pacifist organizations and their adherents into the united front of struggle for peace acquires great importance in mobilizing the petty-bourgeois masses, progressive intellectuals, women and youth against war. While constantly subjecting the erroneous views of sincere pacifists to constructive criticism, and vigorously combating those pacifists who by their policy screen the preparations of the German fascists for imperialist war (the leadership of the Labour Party in Great Britain, etc.), the Communists must invite the collaboration of all pacifist organizations that are prepared to go with them even if only part of the way towards a genuine struggle against imperialist war.

The Communists must support the Amsterdam-Playel anti-war and anti-fascist movement by active collaboration with it and help to extend it.

3. *The combination of the struggle against Imperialist war with the struggle against Fascism.* The anti-war struggle of the masses striving to preserve peace must be very closely combined with the struggle against fascism and the fascist movement. It is necessary to conduct not only general propaganda for peace, but primarily propaganda directed against the chief instigators of war, against the fascist and other imperialist war parties, and against concrete measures of preparation for imperialist war.

4. *The struggle against Militarism and Armaments.* The Communist Parties of all capitalist countries must fight: against

military expenditures (war budgets), for the recall of military forces from the colonies and mandated territories, against militarization measures taken by capitalist governments, especially the militarization of the youth, women and the unemployed, against emergency decrees restricting bourgeois-democratic liberties with the aim of preparing for war ; against restricting the rights of workers employed in war industry plants ; against subsidizing the war industry and against trading in or transporting arms. The struggle against war preparation measures can be conducted only in closest connection with the defense of the economic interests and political rights of the workers, office employees, toiling peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie.

5. *The struggle against Chauvinism.* In the struggle against chauvinism the task of the Communists consists in educating the workers and the whole of the toiling population in the spirit of *Proletarian Internationalism*, which can be accomplished only in the struggle against the exploiters and oppressors for the vital class interests of the proletariat, as well as in the struggle against the bestial chauvinism of the National-Socialist parties and all other fascist parties. At the same time the Communists must show that the working class carries on a consistent struggle in defense of the national freedom and independence of all the people against any oppression or exploitation, because only the Communist policy defends to the very end the national freedom and independence of the people of its country.

6. *The national liberation struggle and the support of wars of national liberation.* If any weak state is attacked by one or more big imperialist powers which want to destroy its national independence and national unity, to dismember it, as in the historic instance of the partition of Poland, a war conducted by the national bourgeoisie of such a country, to repel this attack may assume the character of a war of liberation, in which the working class and the Communists of that country cannot abstain from intervening. It is the task of the Communists of such a country, while carrying on an irreconcilable struggle to safeguard the economic and political positions of the workers, toiling peasants and national minorities, to be, at the same time, in the front ranks of the fighters for national independence and to wage the war of liberation to a finish, without allowing "their" bourgeoisie to strike a bargain with the attacking powers at the expense of the interests of their country.

It is the duty of the Communists actively to support the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially the Red Army of the Chinese Soviets in their struggle against the Japanese and other imperialists and the Kuomintang. The Communist Party of China must exert every effort to extend the front of the struggle for national liberation and to draw into it all the national forces that are ready to repulse the robber campaign of the Japanese and other imperialists.

IV. FROM THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE TO THE STRUGGLE FOR REVOLUTION

The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International most determinedly repudiates the slanderous contention that Communists desire war, expecting it to bring revolution. The leading role of the Communist Parties of all countries in the struggle for the preservation of peace, for the triumph of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, proves that the Communists are striving with all their might to obstruct the preparations for and the unleashing of a new war.

The Communists, while fighting also against the illusion that war can be eliminated while the capitalist system still exists, exert and will exert every effort to prevent war. Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace, to the struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war against the fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism.

The Congress at the same time warns Communists and revolutionary workers against anarcho-syndicalist methods of struggle against war, which take the form of refusing to appear for military service, the form of a so-called boycott of mobilization, of committing sabotage in war plants, etc. The Congress considers that such methods of struggle only do harm to the proletariat. The Russian Bolsheviks who, during the World War, fought energetically against war and were for the defeat of the Russian government rejected such methods; these methods merely make it easier for the bourgeoisie to take repressive measures against Communists and revolutionary workers, and prevent the latter from winning over the toiling masses, especially the soldier masses, to the side of the mass

express in words the horror of the misfortunes which the crisis has caused the masses of the people. These misfortunes are affecting the position of the masses with particular severity at the present time, when the social and political consequences of the economic crisis are unfolding to the full.

At the same time, however, changes have been observed in the very development of the world economic crisis. Undoubtedly, *some improvement in the economic situation* has set in compared with 1932, but this improvement is very uneven. There are countries, like Great Britain, Japan, partly Italy, and the Scandinavian countries, where output has exceeded the pre-crisis level of 1929 ; but there is another type of big country, such as the United States and Germany, where output has only reached 86 to 87 per cent of pre-crisis level ; and, finally, there are countries like France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and Switzerland, where output is bumping along the lowest crisis level.

Can we, on the basis of these facts, draw the conclusion that the capitalist world has emerged from the state of depression, that the economic crisis is over ? No. No such conclusion can be drawn. No such conclusion can be drawn because even in those countries which have exceeded the 1929 level of production symptoms of a fresh outbreak of the crisis are to be observed. If we take 1929 as the highest index of the pre-crisis situation we find that in 1932 world output amounted to 66 per cent and that in the first half of 1935 it amounted to 86 per cent. The world crisis seems to be mid-way between the lowest point of 1932 and the high pre-crisis level of 1929. Although it has abated somewhat, the agrarian crisis is continuing ; world foreign trade has dropped to two-thirds of that of 1929 ; and the financial crisis, although it is not as acute as it has been in past years, is not over. This is not only shown by inflation in Italy and devaluation in Belgium, but also by the menace of devaluation in Germany and in France. The general post-war crisis of capitalism has not subsided, on the contrary, it has become more profound and acute as a result of the world economic crisis.

However, the possibility is not precluded that a further improvement in capitalist economy may take place in the near future. But even if capitalism does succeed in temporarily improving its economic situation, it will not succeed in achieving the relative stabilization that was ushered in after the first round of wars and revolutions, or in overcoming its general

post-war crisis. Capitalism is like a sick man doomed to die; his general state of health is continuously becoming worse, although, at times, the mortally sick man feels a little better.

The general worsening of the position of capitalism is indicated by the feverish preparations that are being made for an imperialist war. A regrouping of capitalist states has taken place which is reflected in the collapse of the Versailles system and the annulment of the Washington Agreement. The Germany that was the victim of imperialist Versailles, enjoying the sympathy of the world working class, no longer exists; its place is taken by a Germany that is the bulwark of fascist obscurantism and reaction, which, on the bones of the German workers, has established a barbarous regime which is rousing the burning hatred of the toilers of the whole world. Weimar Germany no longer exists; its place has been taken by fascist Germany, which threatens to suppress other nations, which is feverishly arming, which is instigating new imperialist wars, which is furiously preparing for war against the Land of the Soviets.

France, the principal inspirer of Versailles, France, which for many years led in the preparations for a crusade against the U.S.S.R., is now, after the defeat of the Versailles policy as well as of the policy of intrigue against the U.S.S.R., compelled to co-operate with the U.S.S.R. for the purpose of preserving peace. After the World War the countries of the Little Entente were utilized by French imperialism as a barrier against the international influence of the U.S.S.R.; but now these countries are turning more and more against fascist Germany, which is threatening their independence, and are seeking support of the strengthened Land of Soviets against the aggression of German imperialism. The imperialist countries which are not interested in war today cannot, in view of the growing aggression of the imperialist fascist countries—Germany, Japan, and lately Italy—ignore the U.S.S.R., which is the bulwark of peace and of the freedom of nations.

In the Far East, the Washington Agreement, which during the whole of the post-war period determined the relation of forces in the Pacific, has been annulled. By the occupation of Manchuria and its attack on North China, militarist-fascist Japan has started a new partition of the world. Furiously developing its war industries, concentrating military forces in Manchuria and North China, and building strategic roads leading to the frontiers of the U.S.S.R., Japan is transforming the

territories it has seized from China into a *place d'armes* for an attack upon the Land of Soviets. It is not the League of Nations that is the principal source of imperialist wars, but the states that are withdrawing from it in order that their hands may be free to wage wars of conquest, i.e., Germany and Japan, which have already withdrawn from the League of Nations, and Italy, which is preparing to withdraw.

Corresponding to the collapse of the Versailles Treaty and the Washington Agreement in the arena of international relations there is a collapse of bourgeois democracy and a growth of the fascist movement in the internal relations of the capitalist states. This coincidence is not accidental, for the maturing of the conditions for imperialist wars are inseparably connected with the growth of political reaction. In Germany, the centre of Europe, fascism came into power and established the most brutal and terroristic regime for the toilers. Germany was followed by the ruling classes of Austria and Spain. In all capitalist countries the fascist attack on the vital interests and elementary rights of the toilers is unfolding. As a result of the world economic crisis the capitalist world has sunk a few steps lower towards suffocating reaction, and it is reviving in the twentieth century the times of the Inquisition, of torture, of the stake and mass assassination.

Under the influence of the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., as a consequence of the economic crisis in the capitalist world, of the war that has started in the Far East and the accession of fascism to power in Central Europe, *a growing change is taking place in the temper of the broad masses of the working class, and primarily, among the Social-Democratic workers in the reformist trade unions.* This change is materially expressed in *the increase in the fighting capacity of the working class* for the fight against fascism and war, evidence of which is to be found in the dimensions assumed by the anti-fascist movement in France, and by the armed struggles in Austria and in Spain. This change is also expressed by the *powerful movement towards unity of action* among all sections of the working class, irrespective of party and trade union affiliation. Although this movement for unity is still only in the initial stage of its development, it will inevitably grow and become strong; the decisions of our Seventh World Congress will help this movement to achieve further successes to an enormous degree.

This change also manifests itself in the crisis in the Second

International. We have in mind the political suicide of the German Social-Democratic Party, which, by the policy it pursued, not only paved the way for fascism, but capitulated before it when Hitler came into power, and thus not only showed that it was not a socialist party but that it was not even a democratic party.

We have also in mind the collapse of the next strongest party affiliated to the Second International, viz., the "Left" Social-Democratic Party of Austria, at whose expense there has grown up during the past eighteen months the Communist Party of Austria, which is becoming a mass party, and which, today, under the conditions of fascist terror, has a membership of 16,000, compared with the three of four thousand members it had before February, 1934.

We also have in mind the growing process of differentiation that is taking place in the ranks of the Social-Democratic Parties, the crystallization in them of a Left wing, which is more and more sharply opposing the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the leaders of these parties, and is demanding unity of action between the masses of the workers in these parties and the Communists.

Finally, the change in the working class movement is reflected in the increased political and organizational strength of the Sections of the Communist International. There is hardly a single Party in the Communist International which has not doubled or trebled its membership during the past two years. Even those Parties which have borne the terrible blows of fascism—for example, the Communist Party of Germany—although their membership has been reduced compared with the period of legality, have nevertheless preserved their broad mass basis in spite of the terror. Fresh strata of workers, who hitherto have been outside of politics altogether, have been drawn into the Communist movement. Not during all the years since the end of the World War and the beginning of the October Revolution have we seen such a movement towards Communism as we have today.

Such are the main changes in the international situation and in the working class movement which determined the fundamental tactical line of the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

What is the essence of the tactical line of the Seventh Congress? The success of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., which has strengthened the positions of the world proletariat

in the struggle against capital, the collapse of capitalist stabilization which has been making the position of the bourgeoisie more and more difficult, the beginning of the transition of the main masses of the working class to the position of the class struggle, and the growing desire of the Social-Democratic workers for a united front with the Communists, are more and more transforming the international working class into an *effective force* capable of exercising decisive influence on the progress of events in each separate country and in the world arena.

The proletariat can no longer be satisfied with merely the propagandist repudiation of capitalism; it must, while relying on the U.S.S.R., pursue a policy of revolutionary activity which must be profoundly hostile to the notorious policy of "reforming" the capitalist system that was pursued by Social-Democracy, and which transformed the working class into the tail of the bourgeoisie. The policy of revolutionary activity is the policy of weakening the positions of the bourgeoisie, of disrupting its imperialist undertakings, disrupting the attack which it is preparing against the U.S.S.R., disrupting its attack upon the toilers, its attempt to fascize its dictatorship; it is a policy of *strengthening the positions of the proletariat*.

Today, the internal and external aggression of the bourgeoisie finds its concentrated expression in fascism and war. And in fighting against all forms of bourgeois dictatorship the proletariat must concentrate all its efforts on the struggle against fascism as its bitterest enemy. In fighting against the menace of imperialist war, the proletariat must direct its fire mainly against those states which today are the initiators and instigators of war. In this struggle it must take advantage of all the antagonisms within the capitalist camp—the antagonisms among the imperialist powers in the international arena, the antagonisms among the various groups of the bourgeoisie in the home arena; it must utilize all these antagonisms in a *revolutionary manner* and not allow itself to be utilized by the bourgeoisie and thereby weaken its own positions. It must extend the front of possible allies in the fight against fascism and war to those social groups, classes and nations which are not adherents of the proletarian dictatorship, or adherents of the social revolution. And there is no doubt that such a purposeful proletarian policy, the active intervention of the proletariat in the progress of events, will turn towards it those strata of the toilers who, owing to the influence of the barren

policy of Social-Democracy, wavered to the side of reaction and ensured the victory of fascism in a number of capitalist countries.

And all this calls for a new orientation on the part of the Communist Parties. They must abandon the old propagandist view that the Communists in the working class are only a militant revolutionary opposition in relation to the mass Social-Democratic Parties and mass trade unions, and that they bear no responsibility for what happens to the working class. It is precisely because the Social-Democratic reformist policy has gone bankrupt that the Communists now obtain greater opportunities than ever for pursuing the revolutionary policy of the proletariat; at the same time they must take responsibility for the fate of the working class movement. They cannot be merely organizations for the propaganda of Communist ideas; they must become the most important factor in the political life of their respective countries and of the whole world. By means of the policy of the revolutionary activity of the proletariat they must secure the removal of the last consequences of the defeats which resulted from the policy of Social-Democracy, they must lead the proletariat out of its state of isolation, they must achieve palpable successes in the mass struggle against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war, and prepare the conditions for the final victory of the working class over capitalism.

As against the hopelessness and lack of prospects of Social-Democracy they must hold out the effective prospect of struggle and victory; and this prospect will increase the confidence of the working class in its own strength and strengthen its conviction that the present rulers of the capitalist countries are only transient people, that the real master of the world is the proletariat. This is the essence of the decisions of the Seventh Congress.

Let us examine the main line of our Congress in greater detail.

I. THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

OUR CONGRESS was the *Congress of victorious socialism* in the U.S.S.R.

What does the victory of socialism imply from the point of view of our internal relations? It marks the beginning of a *new stage* in the development of our country. What are the distinguishing features of this stage? First, that the further development of the productive forces of our socialist economy will proceed, and is already proceeding to an increasing degree, without the enormous difficulties which retarded the growth of socialist economy in the first years of the reconstruction period, quite apart from the period of restoration. The degree of socialist industrialization already achieved enables our country to overcome the spontaneous elements of the remnants of capitalist economics, and to raise the socialist planning of national economy to a higher stage than it has attained up to now. Today, it is the *men and women* who are building socialism who are the decisive force in our progress along the road of new socialist achievements. Stalin's slogan, "cadres decide everything", signifies that leap which, in the words of Engels, our socialist country is taking from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom. And this means that a number of difficulties caused either by objective conditions (the technical-economic backwardness of the country), or by the process of changing the economic system of the small producer, have been left behind. We still have difficulties to face, difficulties arising either out of the necessity of overcoming the survival of capitalism in economics and in the minds of men, or out of the situation created by the capitalist environment.

Second, by the socialist industrialization of our country we have prepared the conditions for raising the material and cultural level of the masses to a height that is inaccessible to any capitalist country in the world. Concentrating its attention now on *solicitude for people*, our Party and the Soviet government are putting in the forefront the fundamental task of socialism, the successful fulfilment of which will, in the last analysis, determine the transition to the side of socialism of vast masses of people.

And if up to now our difficulties, on the one hand, and the inadequately rapid rise of the material level of the masses on the other, slightly retarded the turn of the masses of the toilers

towards socialism, now, in the new stage of our development, the power of attraction of socialism increases, and socialism will more and more rapidly rally to its banner millions of men of labour all over the globe.

Third, the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. has caused enormous social-political changes in our country and has given a great impetus to the building of classless socialist society. By broadening the basis of the proletarian dictatorship, these changes fortify it, and thereby fortify the positions of the international working class in its struggle against the bourgeoisie. These changes have enabled the workers' and peasants' government, by the decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets, to extend still further the framework of proletarian democracy and thereby sweep away the prejudices of backward strata in the capitalist countries concerning the proletarian dictatorship. By increasing the social and class homogeneity of the Red Army, these changes increase the power of defense of our country to an enormous degree. Finally, they widen the gulf between socialist society, in which class antagonisms are disappearing more and more, and the capitalist world, where these antagonisms are growing more and more.

In the sphere of international relations, the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. weakens the positions of capitalism by increasing the relative proportion of socialist economy to the whole system of world economy. At the same time, by strengthening the proletarian state, this victory transforms the U.S.S.R. into a force of tremendous significance in world politics. The role of the U.S.S.R. *as a factor of peace among the nations* is growing. The peace policy of the Soviet Union is the policy of the whole of the international proletariat and of all toilers who hate imperialist wars and are fighting against them. Thanks to this policy, the U.S.S.R. is becoming the rallying centre against war for classes, nations, peoples, and states which do not want war and are not interested in it. The role of the U.S.S.R. *as the bulwark of the freedom of peoples* is growing. All the anti-fascist forces of the world are being instinctively drawn to the U.S.S.R. as the land of the widest proletarian democracy. In those states in which remnants of bourgeois-democratic liberties still remain, the people are turning their gaze towards the U.S.S.R. The peoples who are being crucified by the fascist dictatorship regard the U.S.S.R. as the hearth of their liberties. All the champions of human culture and the foes of fascist barbarism are setting their hopes

on the U.S.S.R. The consciousness that there is a land in which the proletariat has created a mighty workers' state is multiplying the forces of the international working class and serves as a means of increasing its fighting ability. In 1927, Comrade Stalin said that the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. will cause a powerful movement towards socialism in all the capitalist countries, and that, in this sense, it will not only be the victory of socialism in a single country, but *victory on a world scale*. Comrades, we are fortunate in living in the epoch of this growing world movement towards socialism which neither fascist terror nor war can stem. That is why the resolutions of the Seventh Congress link the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. with the new stage in the development of the proletarian revolution. That is why the prospect of the whole development of the world working class movement is inseparable from the further victories of socialism in the U.S.S.R. That is why all the key problems of this movement, all its tactical problems, revolve around the central axis—the reinforcement of the U.S.S.R. *as the base of the world proletarian revolution*.

II. THE CONGRESS OF STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM, THE BITTEREST ENEMY OF THE WORKING CLASS

BUT SOCIALISM in the U.S.S.R., which is becoming stronger day after day, is confronted by decaying capitalism. The state of the proletarian dictatorship in the Land of Soviets is confronted by the states of bourgeois dictatorship in the lands of capitalism. Proletarian democracy is confronted with fascism in its most barbarous form, viz., German National-Socialism. Rallying round the U.S.S.R. as the bulwark of peace and freedom, as the fortress of the world proletarian revolution, the international working class is mobilizing its forces against fascism, and primarily, against German fascism, which is the hotbed of war, of unbridled capitalist oppression and bourgeois counter-revolution. The Seventh Congress, the Congress which expressed the burning anti-fascist hatred of the masses of the people, the Congress of the widest mobilization of the workers, peasants and small urban artisans, of mobilization of the nations and peoples suppressed by imperialism, turned its fire mainly against fascism.

Some think that by concentrating our fire mainly against fascism we are relaxing our struggle against the bourgeoisie

as a class. This is the same as if one were to assert that by fighting against imperialism we are blunting the hatred of the masses towards the capitalist system. Is it possible to fight successfully against capitalism without intensifying the struggle against fascism? No, it is not; for fascism is more and more becoming the predominant political form of capitalism in the period of its general crisis. There is no humanitarian, democratic capitalism; there is only barbarous reactionary capitalism, fascist capitalism, imperialist capitalism. Is it possible to fight successfully against the bourgeoisie as a class without directing our fire mainly against fascism? No, it is not; for fascism is the open and cynical form of the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist, most imperialist elements of finance capital. By disrupting the power of these elements we disrupt the positions of the bourgeoisie as a class, for the bourgeoisie as a class is bound by inseparable bonds with the most reactionary, most chauvinist and most imperialist elements of finance capital.

Some think that in raising the question of a united front between Communists and Social-Democrats for the struggle against fascism, we are revising Lenin's description of the role of Social-Democracy as the principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie, and that we are abandoning Stalin's thesis that the fascists and Social-Democrats are not opposites, but twins. Is that the case? If Social-Democracy in Germany and in Austria were not the principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie but the opposites of fascism, fascism would not have come into power either in Germany or in Austria. But ceasing to be the social bulwark of the bourgeoisie, becoming the opposite of fascism, would have meant, not systematically retreating and capitulating before fascism, but fighting it, not directing one's blows against the Communists when fascism attacked the working class, but establishing a fighting alliance with the Communists for the purpose of fighting fascism. By its whole policy of class collaboration, which paved the road to fascism, Social-Democracy demonstrated the truth of the thesis that it is not the opposite but the twin of fascism. By its whole policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie, which helped to cause the masses to become disappointed with bourgeois democracy and created favourable conditions for the development of the fascist movement, Social-Democracy confirmed the truth of Lenin's description of it as the principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie. It is precisely because it was the

twins of fascism and the *principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie* that it led the masses of the workers to defeat in Central Europe and helped the advance of fascist reaction all over the world. Thanks to this policy of systematically retreating before fascism, Social-Democracy placed itself in the position of a hounded and persecuted party in Austria and in Germany; thanks to this policy, hundreds of thousands of Social-Democratic workers and their organizations are now outlawed. It is precisely because of this that the working class, not only in Austria and Germany, but in all capitalist countries, is beginning to reject the policy of the Social-Democratic twins and to adopt the policy of the "opposite" of fascism. This is why they demand that Social-Democracy shall cease to be the principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie. This is the significance of the united front movement that is developing all over the world.

And the Communists would be mere doctrinaires and not revolutionaries if they failed to take into account the changes that are taking place in the ranks of the working class and in the Social-Democratic Parties, if they did not, by means of united front tactics, help the best sections of these parties, and the masses which follow them, to find the path towards the fighting policy of the opposites of fascism, and to stop the bourgeoisie from utilizing the Social-Democratic Parties as its social bulwark. It is precisely because fascism is the point upon which is concentrated all the hatred for capitalism that has accumulated in the ranks of the working class and the toilers for centuries, that we Communists are now making it the main target of the militant activities of the working class. And in acting in this way we do not push our struggle against other forms of bourgeois dictatorship into the background; on the contrary, by mobilizing the masses against fascism we are preparing for the collapse of capitalism and of all forms of bourgeois dictatorship.

"Nevertheless, in acting in this way the Comintern is departing from its previous attitude towards bourgeois democracy"—say the Social-Democrats. "Formerly, you were opponents of bourgeois democracy, now you are becoming its champions." Is that true? No, comrades, it is not true. We Communists have never unreservedly championed bourgeois democracy as the Social-Democratic leaders have done, nor have we unreservedly opposed it as the anarchists do.

We approached the question of bourgeois democracy as

subscribers to revolutionary dialectics, as the disciples of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. For example, during the German revolution (1918-19), when the struggle raged around the question of whether Germany was to be a bourgeois republic or a Soviet republic, when Noske was shooting down the workers on the pretext of protecting the bourgeois republic, at that time, bourgeois democracy was the banner around which all the counter-revolutionary forces of Germany rallied. The position was the same in regard to the Constituent Assembly slogan immediately after our October Revolution. A Constituent Assembly would have been a step backward compared with the Soviet power; it would have been a decisive stage on the road towards the restoration of capitalism in our country. That is why the Bolsheviks dispersed the Constituent Assembly, that is why the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the followers of Kolchak and Denikin, rallied around it. To have come out in defense of bourgeois democracy under such circumstances would have been tantamount to defending the bourgeois counter-revolution against the proletarian revolution.

The situation is different today. Today, the proletariat in most capitalist countries are not confronted with the alternative of bourgeois democracy or proletarian democracy; they are confronted with the alternative of bourgeois democracy or fascism. Today, the slogan, bourgeois democracy, is a step forward compared with fascism. Today, the slogan of the struggle against fascism can serve to rally far wider strata to the movement than the slogan of direct struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. Therefore, the Communists are absolutely right when, in a number of fascist countries, or in countries which are becoming fascist, they put forward the demand for the convocation of a National Constituent Assembly in order to mobilize the masses against fascism.

But the Communists would have committed a crime against the working class had they adopted this attitude towards bourgeois democracy, not only in the period of revolution, but even in the period of capitalist stabilization, when bourgeois democracy was not directly menaced with the fascist danger, when it, and not fascism, was the principal form of social reaction, when the bourgeoisie exercised its rule, not by means of fascism, but by means of bourgeois democracy. In such a period the working class fights against a Weimar Republic, not because it is a republic, but because it is a bourgeois republic

which suppresses the strikes of the working class, which by the hand of the Zoergiebels, shoots down workers' demonstrations, dissolves anti-fascist organizations like the League of Red Front Fighters, and throws revolutionary workers into jail.

However, neither the Communists nor the working class of Germany could adopt this negative attitude towards the Weimar Republic when the fascist movement began to grow very rapidly, and when the danger of the fascists seizing power began to loom ahead. And if today we were to criticize the position taken up by our brother Party in Germany, it would be precisely on the point that it was belated in changing front in relation to the Weimar Republic and continued to repeat its old arguments after the situation had changed.

The Social-Democrats say: "Since the Communists prefer bourgeois democracy to fascism, they, too, are becoming adherents of the 'lesser evil' policy." Yes, we Communists prefer the "lesser evil" to the greater evil. It is not this that separates us from Social-Democracy. We expose the Social-Democratic "lesser evil" policy because that policy meant *the betrayal of bourgeois democracy and directly helping fascism*. Recall what the position of German Social-Democracy was in the period of the Bruening government, the government which paved the way for the accession to power of fascism. This government issued decrees reducing wages, curtailing the political rights of the workers and fascizing the Weimar Republic. In pursuit of their "lesser evil" policy the German Social-Democrats supported these decrees. Was the same line of conduct maintained by the French Communists and Socialists in relation to the French Bruening—the government of Doumergue? No, they fought against the issue of similar decrees in France; and in their united front struggle they secured the overthrow of the Doumergue government and delivered a severe blow at the French bourgeoisie. The German Social-Democrats entered into a bloc with Bruening against the Communists, whereas the Socialist and Communist workers in France formed a bloc against Doumergue. That is the difference.

In the face of fascist violence the German Social-Democrats demoralized the masses by appealing to them to adhere to legality and thereby did not protect bourgeois democracy but threw it into the jaws of fascism; whereas the French Communists, while not abandoning parliamentary methods of struggle, put extra-parliamentary methods of struggle in the fore-

front, and thereby actually protected bourgeois democracy and repulsed the first attack of fascism. That is why we have different results in France from those we have in Germany.

III. A CONGRESS OF STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR, FOR PEACE AND THE DEFENSE OF THE U.S.S.R.

BUT THE international working class has reasons connected with international politics for concentrating all the weight of its blows upon fascism. All modern, large, capitalist states, fascist as well as bourgeois-democratic, are imperialist states; but the most aggressive imperialist policy is being pursued by the fascist governments which cynically trample upon all treaties and carry into the sphere of international relations the gangster methods they employ in their home politics.

The growing menace of world imperialist war is causing all class, national and state, forces to separate into two camps: *the camp of war and the camp of peace*. The centre of the forces which are operating to bring about war, to accelerate its outbreak, is *fascism*: in Europe the most reactionary and aggressive form of fascism exists in Hitler's Germany; in Asia, it is in militarist-fascist Japan. Never have the masses of the people, the workers, the peasants, the urban artisans, all honest adherents of peace, so acutely sensed the fact that fascism means war, as they do at the present time. Germany is now threatening all her neighbours and is striving to achieve hegemony in Europe. Japan, which proclaims that Japanese imperialism has a special mission in Asia, is already waging war in China. Both Germany and Japan turn the spearheads of their aggression against the U.S.S.R. Italy stands fully armed on the frontiers of Ethiopia and is trying to strengthen her position in the Mediterranean.

The centre of the forces which are fighting against war and its instigators is *the U.S.S.R.*, which is rallying around itself not only the international proletariat, but all other classes as well as all weak nations and peoples who do not want war.

Under these circumstances, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International did not declare that all capitalist states are equally responsible for unleashing imperialist war;

it concentrated its blows against the fascist instigators of war, against Germany, Japan and Italy.

It may be asked: Is not this line adopted by the Seventh Congress similar to the position of those who during the world imperialist war searched in blue, white, yellow and other books for the "principal culprit" for the war which had broken out, whereas, in fact, all the imperialist participants in that war were collectively and equally responsible for it? But it is absurd to compare the situation on the outbreak of the world imperialist war in 1914 with the present situation. Today, the U.S.S.R. exists, the Land of victorious Socialism, which has fundamentally changed the direction of imperialist antagonism. Today, the fundamental division of the world into the world of socialism and the world of capitalism is the main world antagonism. Today, the world proletariat has something to defend. It has its own proletarian state to defend. On the other hand, today, fascism exists, the most furious form of bourgeois reaction and imperialist aggression, which threatens to enslave its own and foreign people, and which is directed against the U.S.S.R. as the Land of victorious Socialism. Neither of these things existed in the period of the first world imperialist war. How is it possible to establish abstract "equality" in the approach to the menace of imperialist war today with that in 1914? Today, the defense of the U.S.S.R. determines the main line of policy of the world proletariat in relation to war; whereas in 1914, the best proletarian revolutionaries adopted the position of defeat of one's imperialist government in the war. Today, the position of fighting against Germany, Japan and Italy as the instigators of world war is a genuinely revolutionary position; it is in the interests of the international proletariat, in the interests of preserving peace between the peoples. In 1914, however, the "culprit" theory served as a cloak to conceal the imperialist aims of one's bourgeoisie. Today, for the purpose of fighting for peace, an extremely concrete approach must be adopted towards the positions of the various countries in accordance with the regrouping of forces that has taken place in the camp of the capitalist states.

The old criterion which we used in testing the relations between capitalist states in the period when the Versailles system was established is now useless. That is why the question of our attitude towards the League of Nations stands differently today.

Undoubtedly, the League of Nations bears full responsibility for the situation which has now arisen in the capitalist world. The League of Nations, as the vehicle of the Versailles system, fostered German fascism and led to the danger of a new imperialist war.

But now that the Versailles system is collapsing the role of the League of Nations as the instrument of the Versailles policy is greatly diminished. The withdrawal of the two most aggressive fascist states, Germany and Japan, from the League of Nations, and the fact that the U.S.S.R. has joined it, change the character of the League of Nations. The possibility is created of opposing the capitalist states which belong to the League of Nations to the fascist instigators of war; the possibility is created of utilizing the League of Nations in the interests of preserving peace. In the same way as the masses by their demonstrations in their respective countries bring pressure to bear upon their respective parliaments in order to compel them to adopt this or that measure, it is possible for the masses to bring pressure to bear upon the League of Nations in order to secure the preservation of peace in the sphere of international relations.

On the basis of a similarly concrete approach to the role of the various states, the Congress adopted an extremely important decision on the question of defending small nations and weak states whose independence is threatened by fascist aggression. It would be wrong to put the small nations on the same level as the big predatory imperialists on the plea that both are capitalist states. That is why the Seventh Congress proclaimed for small nations and weak states "the right to defend their national independence" against the attacks of big imperialist powers. It strongly emphasizes the fact that a war waged by the national bourgeoisie of such a country against an imperialist invader may assume a *national liberation character*, and that it is the duty of the Communists in such a case actively to intervene in the armed struggle for national independence, to take their place in the front ranks of this struggle, and to do everything to facilitate the defeat of the imperialist enemy. In this, however, the Communists must, first, strive to transform the war for national independence into a *genuine people's war*, on the model of the Chinese Soviets; they must strive to secure the arming of the whole people in order that the war may be waged in a Jacobin, in a revolutionary, manner.

Second, in order to enlist the whole of the toiling people for the really wide and effective revolutionary defense of their country against the imperialist enemy, the Communists must fight with all their might for the extension of the democratic rights and liberties of the masses of the people, they must fight to strengthen the economic positions of the workers, the peasants and the whole of the toiling population and for complete and genuine equality of rights for the national minorities. Unless this condition is fulfilled victory in the national war will be impossible.

And, third, the Communists will have to call upon the whole people to watch their bourgeoisie vigilantly and to organize the masses of the toilers against the betrayers of the country and the people. The Communists must not attack the national bourgeoisie because they are waging war, but because they are not waging it with sufficient determination and energy, because they are waging it with useless capitalist weapons and in fear of the masses of the people, are striving to strike a bargain with the imperialist enemy.

Not only is "equality" inappropriate in approaching the specific features in the position of each separate country; it is also inappropriate in the tactics of the Communist Parties which are operating in entirely different circumstances. Today, the tactics of the Communist Party which is in power and the tactics of the Communist Parties which are only just marching towards the conquest of power by the working class need not always be the same; whereas in 1915, when the U.S.S.R. did not yet exist, defeatism was the obligatory tactics for proletarian revolutionaries in all belligerent countries.

In his report to the Seventh Congress, Comrade Ercoli showed that the position of the Communist Party in power in the land of the proletarian dictatorship, and the position of the Communists who are organizing the working class for the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, might not coincide.

Comrades, you will remember that recently the bourgeoisie, and following them, the Socialists, thought they had discovered a "contradiction" between what Comrade Stalin said in his conversation with Laval and the position of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, particularly that of the Communist Party of France which votes against military credits, against the war measures of "its" bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie and Socialist press gloatingly asserted that Comrade Stalin's statement, which served the cause of peace

among nations, would not be understood by the French proletariat.

How did the masses of the toilers, and, primarily, the workers of France, reply to this assertion? Did they understand that the U.S.S.R.'s peace policy is directed against fascist aggression and serves the interests of all nations, serves to strengthen the position of the proletariat? Ten days after the publication of the report of Comrade Stalin's conversation with Laval, the municipal elections took place in Paris and its environs. The French working class and the broad masses of the toilers replied with an increased vote for the Communists exceeding all expectations. By their vote, the toilers of France emphasized the fact that they fully approve of the peace policy pursued by the Soviet proletariat, and that they understand perfectly the difference between its position and the position of the French Communists.

What is the position of the French Communists?

The French proletariat is vitally interested in the strictest observance of the Franco-Soviet agreement, which serves the interests of universal peace against the fascist instigators of war. But the French proletariat and the French Communists have not concluded any agreement with "their" bourgeoisie. At any moment the French bourgeoisie may try to move its army against the working class. This army not only serves the purpose of defending France against German fascism; it also serves the imperialist aims of suppressing colonial peoples. Among the French officers there are not a few fascist elements who are dreaming about a fascist coup d'etat in the country, and who are striving to come to an agreement with the German fascists at the expense of the people of France. That is why the French Communists declare that they will vote against military credits and against all the military measures of the French bourgeoisie. Simultaneously, they expose and will unyieldingly expose to the broad masses of the people the wavering and vacillation of the fascist and semi-fascist bourgeois politicians who are trying to come to an understanding with German fascism.

And here, comrades, is another example which shows that the Party in power occupies a special position; and failure to understand this may lead to a host of mistakes being committed when working out the tactical line. I refer to the slogan of boycotting Italy in connection with the Italo-Ethiopian conflict.

The Second and Amsterdam Internationals are calling upon the League of Nations to apply sanctions to fascist Italy as the disturber of peace. But can they guarantee that all the states which belong to the League of Nations will *really collectively, really conscientiously*, and without deception, apply these sanctions to Italy? Of course not. But all the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy demand that the proletarian state shall be the first to apply these sanctions.

Suppose, however, that the bourgeois states will not apply these sanctions and that the U.S.S.R. will be the only state that will follow the advice of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, who will gain by this? The capitalist states, which will maintain relations with Italy. Who will lose by it? Not Italy, but the U.S.S.R. Actually, the boycott will hit, not fascist Italy, but the socialist Land of Soviets. Moreover, the closing of the Suez Canal, which the Second and Amsterdam Internationals are demanding, coincides with the interests of British imperialism, which is displaying an extremely suspicious concern for the "independence" of Ethiopia. But the Communists do not want to follow in the wake of fascist policy, nor do they want to be towed by British imperialism. Would it not be better, therefore, if the Communists concentrated their efforts on the independent action of the masses under the slogan, "Not a train, not a ship to assist the Italian war in Ethiopia," while not refraining, of course, from bringing pressure to bear on the League of Nations as a subsidiary means of struggle?

Such is the position in regard to difference in tactics.

The new situation calls for a somewhat different presentation of the question of the prospects of the *toilers' struggle against war*. Here, too, the old stereotyped forms, which smack of pure propaganda, are useless. Undoubtedly, *as long as capitalism exists, war is inevitable*. But it is also beyond doubt that we cannot be satisfied with merely asserting "this absolutely correct thesis and with waiting fatalistically with folded arms for the next imperialist war. We now have greater opportunities for waging a successful struggle against imperialist wars than we had on the eve of 1914. Today, we have a state of the proletarian dictatorship, which, becoming stronger day after day, is standing on guard for peace. Today, this state has a mighty Red Army which is a weapon in the struggle of the international proletariat for peace. Today, we have a world party of the working class—the Communist International—

which will not surrender on the outbreak of war as the Second International did. Today, after the experience of the war of 1914-18, a particularly profound hatred for war is maturing and growing among the masses of the workers in the midst of the growing war danger. Today, relying on the U.S.S.R., taking advantage of the antagonisms among the capitalist states, the world proletariat has the opportunity of creating a broad people's anti-war front, which should not only include other classes, but also weak nations and peoples whose independence is menaced by war. Today, owing to the peace policy of the Soviet Union, the international proletariat can utilize in the struggle against war the position taken by those big states which for various reasons do not want, or fear, war. And all this makes it necessary for the Communist Parties, not only to carry on propaganda against war, but also to pursue a real anti-war policy, an important condition for which is the organization of all the forces of the working class. Without this organization of proletarian forces, neither a successful struggle against war, nor a struggle against fascism, which is instigating it, are possible.

IV. A CONGRESS OF STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

A. THE UNITED FRONT

THAT IS why our Congress was a Congress of struggle *for the unity* of the international working class movement, *for unity of action, for trade union unity, for political unity.* First of all I will deal with the question of the united front. The essence of the united front does not lie in a formal agreement between two parties (the Communist Party and the Social-Democratic Party) which cease fighting during the period of operation of the agreement with a view to establishing "spheres of influence" in the working class movement, as if to say: "This is your section and this is mine; let's not interfere with each other, let's live quietly like good neighbours, without excitement and without offending each other." That is the way the question may be presented by a petty-bourgeois who desires to lead a calm and peaceful life, and not by those who have the interests of the working class at heart. Agree-

ments and pacts are subsidiary matters; the main thing in the united front is the joint action of workers belonging to various political trends against the common enemy, capital, *action which presupposes that the Social-Democratic workers come over to the position of the class struggle.* Without this basis, *without the class struggle,* there can be no united front. And as in the capitalist countries large masses of workers are organized in the Social-Democratic Parties and in the reformist trade unions, and as these masses are bound by the discipline of these parties and trade unions, an agreement with these organizations is necessary in order to unleash the struggle of the masses in a united front against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war.

Nor is it right to imagine that the main thing in the united front is to expose the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy. It is necessary to expose those elements which are disrupting the struggle of the working class, for it is impossible to fight against capital successfully without resisting the scabs who are protecting the interests of capital. But the exposure of these elements is not an end in itself; it is subordinate to the principal aim of the united front, *viz., to mobilize the masses of the workers for the struggle against capital.*

What the united front should really be has been illustrated by the united front movement in France.

Comrades, you remember how that movement developed. It began with a modest anti-war movement organized by our late Comrade Barbusse, a movement which became extremely active after Hitler came into power in Germany. The fury of the fascist regime in Germany, which showed what fascism had in store for the masses of the workers, the revival of the activities of the French fascists, who were encouraged by the easy victory achieved by the fascists in Germany, the feverish arming of German fascism, the alarm felt by the toiling masses of France at the growing war danger, the growing sympathy of these masses for the U.S.S.R., which increased particularly after the French government had abandoned its anti-Soviet policy, all this created favourable soil for the development of an anti-fascist movement. On February 6, 1934, the French fascists, who had not yet become sufficiently strong, decided to measure forces and to secure the overthrow of parliamentary government. Taking advantage of the sensational case of the embezzler Staviski, French fascism came out in the streets ostensibly to fight against parliamentary corruption. It was

indeed a strange spectacle! The vehicles of the most corrupt movement in the world, which is financed by the big magnates of capital, come out as the champions of stern incorruptibility!

The Radical government of Daladier called out the police and the gendarmerie to protect the premises of parliament which the fascists threatened to wreck. A collision occurred between the fascists and the armed forces of the government. The result was that several were killed and a few score were injured. All the reactionaries howled: "Shooting down the people!" Oh, it is quite permissible to shoot down workers, but it is not permissible to touch top-hatted scoundrels who wreck working class homes!..

For a moment consternation reigned in the ranks of the Communist Party. At first, the fascist slogan, "Down with the Daladier government, the government of assassins!" did not meet with adequate resistance on the part of the Communist Party. Here and there Communists followed the fascists in the street and repeated their call for the overthrow of the Daladier government. But the Communist Party quickly found its bearing and began to criticize Daladier, not for shooting, but *for not having shot enough, for capitulating* to the onslaught of the fascists, for the fact that, having learned about the collision between the police and gendarmes and the fascist conspirators, he burst into tears and *resigned*. What can one do about it? Such is the "heroism" of the modern descendants of Mirabeau, who, in defending the bourgeois republic, fear their own determination more than they fear the devil!

And if the working class had not been on the alert this republic would have been betrayed by the republicans. The working class instinctively felt that its resoluteness in fighting fascism would determine the degree of resoluteness of the republican elements of the population of France. On February 9, in response to the appeal of the Communist Party, the proletariat of Paris came out in the streets in a counter-demonstration against fascism. Notwithstanding the fact that the Socialist Party had called upon its members not to take part in this Communist demonstration, the Socialist workers were present on the Place de la Republique and fought bravely against the police side by side with the Communists. Without pacts or agreements, in a situation inflamed to white heat by political passions, the workers of Paris formed a united front in spite of the opposition of the Socialist leaders.

The temper of the workers in all other parts of France

was such that the leaders of the Socialist Party and of the reformist trade unions realized that they must provide an outlet for it, otherwise the anger of the masses would overwhelm them. That is why the reformist Confederation of Labour called for a general strike for February 12, and the Unitary Confederation of Labour—which was preparing for a political strike for February 7—called upon the workers to support this strike. Rarely in the history of the working class movement has a strike taken place in such an atmosphere of sympathy of the broad masses of the population as the strike of February 12, in which nearly 4,000,000 people were involved, and which commenced simultaneously with the armed struggle of the Austrian workers. Revolution was in the air. The bourgeoisie realized that the situation was strained to breaking point, and that the working class would not permit fascism to come into power without a fight.

The February days marked a *turning point* in the working class movement of Europe; they marked the transition from the *fascist offensive to the proletarian counter-offensive*. The events of those days shook the confidence of the bourgeoisie and increased the confidence of the proletariat in its own strength. They marked a sharp turn of the Socialist and reformist workers to the position of the class struggle. Amidst the fire of battle, they laid the foundations of a unity of action which no tricks and devices could break. At the Toulouse Congress of the Socialist Party in the spring of 1934 nearly one-third of the delegates voted in favour of sending a delegation to Moscow to negotiate for the organization of united action. As a matter of fact, this vote of the Socialist upper ranks showed that *in the lower ranks the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of the Socialist masses were in favour of the united front*.

Nevertheless, though the reactionary sections of the Socialist upper ranks were no longer able to disrupt the united front movement, they were still able to *retard* it by their opposition. It is well known that in days of great fighting the Socialist workers are more inclined to take part in joint actions with the Communists, in spite of the prohibition of the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders, than in the period of calm that follows hot fighting. That is why the Communist Party strove to conclude a formal pact with the leaders of the Socialist Party for united action. The Right wing of the Socialist Party manoeuvred, and opposed the slogan for the united

front of struggle with the slogan of the amalgamation of the two parties. The Communist Party exposed this crude manoeuvre of the opponents of the united front by putting forward concrete points as a platform upon which the amalgamation was to take place, points which subsequently served as the basis for the decisions of the Seventh Congress on the question of the political unity of the working class movement. On July 27, 1934, a united action pact was signed between the two parties. Has it produced any positive results? Undoubtedly it has. The working class and the toilers of France have gained by united action; the bourgeoisie and the fascists have lost.

United action helped the French proletariat to repel the first onslaught of fascism in France, to dissolve the Doumergue government—the government which was preparing for the fascist dictatorship—and helped to weaken capital's attack on the standard of living of the masses, particularly of the state and municipal employees. The establishment of a united front of struggle served as the starting point for a great movement for trade union unity, which subsequently led to the amalgamation of a number of trade union organizations, particularly of the railwaymen, and paved the way for the amalgamation of the two Confederations into a single Confederation of Labour. The united front served as the basis for the general people's front of struggle against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war, a people's front which became the centre of attraction for the anti-fascist forces among other classes of the population. By its experience, the French proletariat enriched the whole of the world working class movement and demonstrated to it that *timely* action against fascism (unlike what happened in Austria and Spain) can avert heavy sacrifices and the bitterness of defeat. Finally, the united front movement in France has brought the question of unity before the whole international working class movement as the question of the day. Today international Social-Democracy cannot turn its back on the united front, for it has become the demand of millions of workers all over the world!

B. TRADE UNION UNITY

The reformists cannot now turn their backs on trade union unity, which, after the Seventh Congress, has become the *decisive task* of the whole of the international working class.

And this is not a task of the *remote future*; it is the *burning question of today and tomorrow*, the practical fulfilment of which will show whether we are able to fight for the application of the new tactical orientation adopted by the Seventh Congress.

The fulfilment of this task calls for greater persistence, energy and skilful approach than ever, because, in this sphere, in the sphere of trade union unity, we are confronted by enormous difficulties and, for the time being, we have far fewer successes of record in this sphere than in regard to the establishment of the united front in the political sphere. This is due to the fact that while in the majority of cases our parties represent a fairly considerable force compared with the Social-Democratic Parties, and are capable of bringing considerable pressure to bear on the Social-Democratic Parties, we are weak in the trade union movement. Except for France and Czechoslovakia, we have no large Red trade unions in the capitalist countries of Europe. But even in France and Czechoslovakia, the relation of forces between the Red unions and the reformist unions is less in our favour than the relation of forces between the Communist Parties and the Social-Democratic Parties. However, owing to the fact that the Red trade unions in France were stronger than those in other capitalist countries, they have succeeded in breaking down the opposition of the reformist Confederation of Labour and have made great progress in the matter of amalgamating the trade unions. But this cannot be said in regard to other countries, where the Communists are now paying dearly for their sectarian sins of past years. We are lagging behind in the matter of trade union unity, in establishing the united front of struggle in the economic sphere, because we have not worked in the reformist trade unions as we should have done.

Another reason why the united front is developing more slowly in the trade union sphere is that during an economic crisis, when a huge army of unemployed exists, it is easier to develop political struggles than to organize strikes.

All these reasons explain why the reformist trade union leaders, the majority of whom are opposed to trade union unity,

have been able up to now to prevent the more rapid development of the united front in the trade union sphere ; and this, in turn, has hindered the further development and organisational consolidation of the united action front. The international united action front would have made enormous progress had we succeeded in bringing about trade union unity.

The opponents of trade union unity justify their position, which is fatal to the interests of the proletariat, on the ground that such unity would not add much to the forces which the Amsterdam International already has at its command today. These people usually advance the following argument : the Amsterdam International has, about 9,000,000 members, whereas the Red International of Labour Unions has, in the capitalist countries, slightly more than 1,000,000 which, together, would make about 10,000,000.

But this argument is absolutely false ; it is purely mechanical. It reduces a problem of enormous class significance to a simple sum in arithmetic. No, comrades, the unity of the working class movement is not arithmetic ; it is a much more complicated thing than that. And, moreover, reformist arithmetic substitutes subtraction for addition. For some reason it "subtracts" from the total membership of the R.I.L.U. the 19,500,000 members of the Soviet trade unions. These nineteen and a half millions do not represent themselves alone ; they represent the Land of victorious Socialism, the land where the proletariat is in power and uses that power to protect the world proletariat. Just think what a power the world working class movement would represent if, instead of reformist subtraction we were to engage in the revolutionary adding up of all the forces of the organized working class ! We would put an end to the "division" which the bourgeoisie has succeeded in causing in the ranks of the organized working class movement and would "multiply" the forces of this movement. And we would multiply these forces because we would be approaching the question of the unity of the working class movement, not arithmetically, but politically.

The revolutionary trade unions would bring a fresh stream into the Amsterdam trade union movement which would quicken its activities. The healing of the split in the trade unions would enable the working class to oppose the capitalist offensive as a united, compact disciplined army. The capitalists would then be unable to take advantage of the split in the ranks of the workers by playing off one section of the

working class against another ; and with proper leadership, the united trade union movement would, in the majority of cases, ensure a successful outcome of the struggle for the immediate demands of the workers. The amalgamation itself would rouse tremendous enthusiasm, not only among the organized workers, but also among the masses of unorganized workers. And this, in addition to the practical and palpable results achieved in the struggle for direct demand as a consequence of the amalgamation, would cause a great influx of the broad masses of the unorganized workers into the united trade unions. Experience in France has already shown that where trade union unity has been actually achieved, for example among the railwaymen, there is already an increased influx of unorganized workers into the unions ; whereas the maintenance of a divided trade union movement not only hinders the development of united action but also the recruiting of new members for the trade unions.

If a united trade union centre were formed as a result of the amalgamation of the Amsterdam International and the R.I.L.U., the numerous autonomous, anarcho-syndicalist and Christian trade unions would be obliged to co-ordinate their actions with the big united unions, and in many cases they would not even be able to keep out of the trade union unity movement. The latter point is particularly important for Spain, where there is a strong anarcho-syndicalist movement, and for Czechoslovakia, where there are several trade union centres.

The advocates of pure arithmetic do not realize to what extent unity would raise the prestige of the trade unions in the eyes of the unorganized workers, to what extent it would increase the confidence of the working class in its organizations. Such an increase in the degree of organization of the working class, the raising of its fighting spirit, the increased confidence in its own strength, the co-ordination of its fight against capital, would serve as a mighty barrier against fascism, which by every means in its power—terror, bribery, social-demagogy and slander—is striving to sow confusion in the ranks of the workers and to demoralize them.

We do not lay down any conditions for trade union unity. All we want is that the united trade unions shall actually protect the economic interests of the working class. We do not want the trade unions to be used as organs of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, which is contrary to their class function. And

if this is accepted, the question of trade union democracy settles itself. Why is there no democracy in the reformist trade unions? Why is the will of the rank-and-file trade union masses frustrated? Why are the individual members and whole organizations which are most devoted to the cause of the working class, expelled? Because the reactionary reformist leaders pursue a policy which conforms neither to the class interests of the workers, nor to their will. If this policy is abandoned, if the trade unions become organs of the class struggle, it will not be necessary to suppress the will of the masses or to expel the most active adherents of the class struggle. And we Communists plainly and openly say to the millions of workers: without severing the bloc with the bourgeoisie there cannot be either durable trade union unity or trade union democracy.

C. A UNITED PARTY

But while *severing the bloc with the bourgeoisie* is sufficient to bring about and to consolidate trade union unity, it is not sufficient to bring about political unity, which is a higher form of unity than trade union unity. The consolidation of the forces of the working class in a single political party is a much more difficult and complicated task than achieving trade union unity. This question is giving rise to considerable doubt even in our own ranks. "What! Unite with the Social-Democrats?" some comrades ask in perplexity. "But why have we been waging an irreconcilable struggle against Social-Democracy during the whole of the post-war period? Why have we worked so hard to Bolshevize the Sections of the Comintern? Why have we been fighting against opportunist deviations in our own ranks, i.e., against the slightest deviation of unstable elements in the direction of Social-Democracy? Will not the political struggle we have waged in the past have been in vain?" "No, comrades. It will not have been in vain.

Had we not fought against Social-Democracy, against every sort of deviation in our ranks, for the Bolshevization of the Communist Parties during the whole of the post-war period, we would not have been able to present the question of a united party as we are able to do now. By our struggle against all forms of opportunism we steered our Parties and built the main Communist framework, and consequently, we are now able boldly to take the initiative in the creation of a united political party of the working class.

In 1920, when Lenin wrote his Twenty-one Conditions, we could not approach the question of the political unity of the working class in the way we are able to do today. Why? Because what we had in the capitalist countries at that time were more in the nature of propagandist Communist groups than parties tried in battle and enriched with Bolshevik experience. Recall what one of our largest and most advanced Sections was at that time; I refer to the Communist Party of Germany in 1920, after the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. The Party was then torn by internal disagreement; it contained "Lefts" "National-Bolsheviks," and Rights of the type of Paul Levi; and it bore a huge burden of Social-Democratic survivals and vacillations. Or recall the case of Hungary in 1919: as a result of the amalgamation of the young Communist Party of Hungary—which had not yet become politically hardened and organizationally strong—with the large Social-Democratic organization, the Communist vanguard was submerged in the petty-bourgeois sea of Social-Democracy; and this was one of the principal reasons why the Soviet power in Hungary collapsed.

Now, as a result of many years of struggle for the Bolshevization of our Parties, having achieved the iron unity of our ranks—which in many countries have received their baptism of fire in big class battles and have passed the test of underground work—we are able, in the present concrete situation, to present the question of creating a united revolutionary party of the proletariat *in a new way*.

And such a presentation of the question of the political unity of the working class movement is infallible from the point of view of *principle*. We Communists are the party of the proletarian revolution, the party of the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. But unless the forces of the working class are united in both the economic sphere and political sphere, the victory of the proletariat cannot be achieved. The split in the working class movement is only to the advantage of the bourgeoisie and enables the latter to prevent the victory of the proletariat. On the other hand, in fighting for the proletarian dictatorship, the Communists are preparing for the achievement of complete proletarian unity; for only under the dictatorship of the proletariat will the influence of the bourgeoisie upon the proletariat be destroyed and all possibility of splitting the working class disappear. That is why the Communists are the genuine

vehicles of the unity of the working class movement.

Can the party which stands for class collaboration with the bourgeoisie say the same about itself? By its collaboration with the bourgeoisie such a party splits the ranks of the proletariat and thereby strengthens the position of the bourgeoisie, facilitates the defeat of the proletariat and prevents the victory of the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Those who, like the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy, still abide by the position of class collaboration, cannot be anything else than enemies of the unity of the working class movement, deliberate splitters of its ranks. That is why we Communists alone have the right to raise the banner of the political unity of the working class movement, the banner of the united revolutionary party of the proletariat.

But we Communists are not in favour of any sort of unity, of unity at any price. Of what value is the "unity" of the Labour Party if that "unity" is utilized by the reactionary leaders of that party for the purpose of supporting the policy of the bourgeoisie? Before the February events, the Austrian Social-Democratic Party also boasted about its "unity"; but this unity was unable to stand the test of the very first serious class battles. Such formal unity merely retards the transition of the Social-Democratic workers to the position of the class struggle. We Communists stand for organizational political unity *on the basis of principles*. We stand for a united party of the working class which will unreservedly serve its interests, the interests of the struggle for the *proletarian revolution*.

That is why the Seventh Congress declared that the creation of such a party is possible only on the condition of "*complete independence from the bourgeoisie and a complete severance of the bloc between Social-Democracy and the bourgeoisie*, on the condition that *unity of action be first brought about, that the necessity of the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets be recognized; that support of one's own bourgeoisie in imperialist war be rejected; and that the party be constructed on the basis of democratic centralism which ensures unity of will and action and has been tested by the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks.*" (Quoted from the resolution of the Seventh Congress on Georgi Dimitroff's report.)

If one ponders over the conditions for the political amalga-

mation of the workers' parties advanced by the Seventh Congress, it will become clear that they constitute the core of the programme of the Communist International. We do not demand the formal recognition of the programme of the Communist International as a condition for amalgamation because we want, by adopting a proper approach to the Social-Democratic workers, to help them to cast off many Social-Democratic prejudices ; because we do not want to provide an argument for the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy in their agitation in opposition to the slogan for a united party. We do not add to the condition of the Seventh Congress the demand that a definite attitude be taken towards the Soviet Union, because the sincere recognition of the "dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets" determines one's attitude towards the U.S.S.R. We do not put forward the demand for a struggle against the colonial policy of one's own bourgeoisie, because rejection of "support of one's own bourgeoisie in *imperialist war*" presupposes that the parties will fight against the most arrogant and insolent form of imperialist policy, *viz.*, colonial policy.

We are often asked why we are now laying down five conditions for unity instead of twenty-one as we did at the Second Congress of the Communist International. We are doing that because the five conditions of the Seventh Congress essentially cover the twenty-one conditions of the Second Congress ; because the Communist International is not now in danger of being swamped by Centrism ; because the working class has not only passed through the post-war experience of the policy of Right-wing German Social-Democracy, but also of "Left" Austrian Social-Democracy ; because there is not yet an "influx" of Social-Democratic leaders into the Communist International, what we have as yet is a stream of Social-Democratic workers towards Communism ; because our five conditions wholly correspond to the thoughts and sentiments of these workers.

Will it be a bad thing if a wide discussion on the five conditions formulated by our Congress takes place in the Social-Democratic Parties ? No, it will not.

Will it be a bad thing if hundreds of thousands of Social-Democratic workers say : "The programme of Party unity put forward by the Communist International is the programme for which our class brothers suffered in Germany, Austria and Spain, in battles and defeats, and for which we are prepared

to fight"? No, it will be a good thing if they do.

Do the five conditions correspond to the interests of the broadest strata of the proletariat? Yes, they do, because they serve as a political platform for these strata in their struggle against the reactionary section of Social-Democracy, which is opposing all forms of unity: unity of action, trade union unity and political unity. Does the presentation of the question of a united party open up any prospect for the united front movement? Yes, it does. Without such a prospect the united front movement would be drifting without a rudder; for Marxist-Leninists have always linked up every movement for partial demands with our ultimate aim. And the inter-relation between the united front and a united party reflects the inter-relation between the movement for partial demands and our ultimate aim.

Today, the existence of two general staffs of the movement is inevitable; but this is a temporary situation caused by the split in the labour movement. The whole experience of the world working class movement and of its battles shows that *united leadership is an elementary condition for success in the struggle*. That is why, by fighting to the utmost to develop the united front, the Communists will prepare the conditions for every form of unity of the working class movement, will prepare the conditions for creating a single general staff for this movement in the form of a united party. The fears expressed by our comrades concerning unity with the Social-Democrats are quite legitimate and are well grounded; but often, comrades who express these fears do not approach either Social-Democracy or the question of a united party dialectically. They take Social-Democracy as it was yesterday, or as it is today, and ignore the process of revolutionization that is taking place among the rank-and-file members. They regard the question of amalgamation from the point of view of the "congealed" relation of forces between the Communists and Social-Democrats in the working class movement. This is wrong, comrades.

The question of a united party must not be regarded from the point of view of yesterday's, or even today's, state of the working class movement. The formation of a united party must be taken as a living, dialectical process of struggle. We shall not unite with the Social-Democrats of yesterday, nor with the people who are rushing from side to side and vacillating today; we shall unite with our class brothers who by their experience of the struggle, cemented by the blood jointly

shed with the Communists, will become convinced that we are right, that the program and tactics of the Communist International are right. The united party slogan is not a slogan for unity between leading bodies ; it is a slogan of the mass struggle, of the persistent and stern struggle which remoulds people and regenerates them in a revolutionary manner. And we advance this slogan to the masses because the Communist movement has grown into manhood, because it can now set itself the task, not only of Bolshevizing the Communist Parties, but of *Bolshevizing the working class*. This is the political significance of the united party slogan.

V. A CONGRESS WHICH SUMMED UP THE LESSONS OF ARMED BATTLES

OUR CONGRESS *was a Congress which summed up the results of the armed battles* which have been fought during the past years : the armed struggle in Austria in February, and that in Spain in October, 1934 ; the numerous heroic battles for the Soviet power waged by the Red Army of China.

The fact that the Social-Democratic workers, even if belatedly, took to arms in order to resist fascism is of tremendous historical significance. The armed struggles of the Austrian and Spanish workers are evidence of the bankruptcy of the policy of Social-Democracy ; they are evidence of the change that is taking place in the temper of the broad masses of the Social-Democratic workers ; they show that considerable strata of Social-Democratic workers and party officials, who for a number of years have been trained in the spirit of class collaboration and of waiting passively for the victory of fascism, are now turning towards the policy of the class struggle, to the policy of actively influencing the progress of events.

These struggles teach us Communists the irrefutable truth that there are hundreds of thousands of proletarians in the ranks of the Social-Democratic Parties who will fight equally with the Communists for the cause of the working class, that if these proletarians are not yet in our ranks we are partly to blame for that, for we have not been able to approach these militant people properly and prove to them that our Party is right and that the Party to which they belong is wrong.

One cannot speak without emotion of the miracles of

heroism displayed by the *Schutzbundler* in the February days in Austria, by the miners of Asturias during the October battles, and by the brave defenders of Oviedo. The names of Muni-chreiter, Koloman, Wallisch, Weisel and Aida Lafuenta will be remembered forever by the working class. Nor will the working class forget the thirty Red Guard prisoners whom the government troops in Asturias put at the head of their column to screen them from the fire of the workers. They will not forget their proud cry: "Don't hesitate, comrades, shoot, the fascists are behind us!" The whole world proletariat bow their heads in respect to the memory of the numerous unknown heroes who rushed forward to storm the whiteguard strongholds with dynamite in their hands and lighted cigarettes between their lips, preferring to die rather than retreat.

Why, then, in spite of this self-sacrifice and devotion to the cause of the revolution, did not the workers of Asturias and the *Schutzbundler* of Austria achieve victory?

In his report at the Seventh Congress Comrade Dimitrov pointed out with striking clarity that the working class can stand in the path of fascism and prevent it from coming into power. The example of France in this respect is very instructive. But in order to avert the victory of fascism the following four conditions are required: (a) the militant activity of the working class itself and the consolidation of its forces in a united proletarian front; (b) the existence of a strong revolutionary party which shall properly lead the struggle of the toilers against fascism; (c) the pursuit by the working class of a correct policy towards the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie; (d) vigilance towards fascism, the aiming of well-timed blows against it and the maintenance of the initiative in the struggle against fascism. Were these elementary conditions for successful struggle against fascism observed in Austria and Spain? No, they were not.

The first condition: *the fighting capacity of the proletariat and the united front*. What was the position in regard to that? Did the Spanish and Austrian Social-Democrats pursue a policy of developing the fighting capacity of the proletariat?

The Austrian and Spanish Social-Democratic leaders not only failed to strengthen the fighting capacity of the working class; they actually weakened it in every possible way. The Spanish Socialists, as it is well known, joined the coalition government which passed an anti-strike law, restricted the rights of the trade unions, introduced the so-called Protection of

Public Order Act under which Social-Democratic workers who took part in the October battles are now being tried ; they did everything to lull the vigilance of the workers towards the monarchist and fascist elements. The Austrian Socialist leaders pursued an even worse policy during the whole of the post-war period, the policy of systematically retreating before the bourgeoisie and fascism.

From 1918 to 1930 the Austrian Social-Democrats were in the government. They then had arms at their command, the arsenals ; they held strong positions in the army, in the police force and in the municipalities, they had the Schutzbund at their command as an organ of defense. But during these thirteen years the Austrian Social-Democrats gradually surrendered all these positions. They subdued the anger of the Viennese proletariat in July, 1927. Like cowards, they signed the notorious Guettenberg pact by which the fascist trade unions were recognized to have the same rights as the free trade unions. The rank-and-file Socialist workers who demanded that the constant retreating should be stopped were admonished by their Social-Democratic leaders and reminded of the "Linz program." And as is well known, this program prescribed waiting until the bourgeoisie struck the first blow ; in other words, taking action only when the bourgeoisie had become strong and the proletariat weak. This is exactly what happened in February, 1934.

The situation in regard to the united front and consolidating the forces of the proletariat for the struggle against the bourgeoisie and fascism was bad. In Spain, where the working class movement is split up more than in any other country, where, in addition to the Socialist and Communist Parties, the influence of anarchism is strong, where there are three Confederations of Labour, the Socialist leaders stubbornly fought against everything that would help to unite the forces of the proletariat. They opposed the formation of factory committees, although factory committees in the hands of the proletariat would have been powerful instruments of trade union unity and the organized representatives of the whole of the working class. They, like the anarchist leaders, refused to enter into any negotiations for trade union unity, although trade union unity was a decisive condition for the successful struggle against fascism. They opposed the formation of Soviets, although the Soviets would have been a means of organizing and consolidating the forces of the proletariat and

the peasantry against the bourgeoisie and the landlords, against fascist reaction, they would have been organs of struggle for the revolutionary seizure of power. Instead of honestly working to establish a united proletarian front embracing the organized as well as unorganized masses, they manoeuvred and proposed a united front of the Workers' Alliance in the form of a coalition of the leading bodies of several working class organizations. The Right-wing elements in the local branches of the Socialist Party sabotaged the entry of the Communists into the Workers' Alliance, and they sabotaged the carrying out of the Communists' proposal to transform the Alliance into elected workers' and peasants' organs of struggle for power.

In Austria things were much worse. The Social-Democratic leaders simply spurned every attempt on the part of the numerically small Communist Party to create a united front on the spurious plea that the "unity" of the proletariat was already achieved within the Social-Democratic Party.

In Spain and in Austria the leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties prepared for the armed struggle, not as for a mass people's movement, but as if it were the business of exclusive party groups operating behind the backs of the masses. They failed to see that "to be successful, insurrection must be based, not on a conspiracy, not on a party, but on the advanced class."*

The result of this policy—which was not intended to unite the working class but to keep it divided—was that in Austria, it was not the working class that rose in armed rebellion, but only a small section of the workers (the Schutzbund); that the Social-Democratic leaders did not even call for a general strike; that while the Schutzbund was fighting, the rest of the workers in Vienna went to work in the usual way, while the railwaymen calmly transported military reinforcements from the provinces for the Dollfuss government.

In Spain, while the miners in Asturias were bravely engaged in a life and death struggle, the Right-wing Socialist leaders in Biscay persuaded the workers who were marching to Bilbao to disperse to their homes because everything was "all over"; and in Barcelona, the anarchist leaders broadcast a message from the government radio station telling the workers to resume work.

**Lenin, Collected Works, Volume XXI, Book 1, p. 224.*

Such was the position in regard to the first fundamental condition for the successful struggle against fascism.

The second condition: *the existence of a strong revolutionary party which shall properly lead the struggle of the toilers against fascism.* Did the Spanish working class have such a party? No. The Communist Party of Spain pursued a correct policy, but it was not strong enough to lead the struggle of the anti-fascist forces in the country. The line pursued by the leaders of the Socialist Party, however, was fundamentally wrong. It was wrong because from the very first days of the revolution the Social-Democrats did not strengthen the positions of the proletariat, but weakened them. The Socialist Party did not strike with all its might against the monarchist and fascist conspirators; it struck its blows at the Left wing of the working class movement. It did not confiscate the land of the big feudal landowners and the Church in order to destroy the economic base of the counter-revolution but actually protected these reactionary forces from the agrarian revolution. It did not dissolve the *Guardia Civil*, which was hated by the people, but strengthened it by forming a "Storm Guard" on the fascist model. It did not purge the army of the reactionary officers, but even granted them pensions. This was not the policy of a revolutionary party; it was the policy of a party that was preparing for the victory of the counter-revolution.

Such also was the policy of the leaders of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, which, step by step, retreated before the onslaught of the Austrian bourgeoisie and fascism. Did the Austrian Social-Democrats in February, and the Spanish Social-Democrats in October, 1934, know whither they were leading the workers? Did they know what the object of the armed fighting was? Was it to seize power? This is what the workers wanted, but the Socialist leaders did not pursue that aim. They wanted to frighten the bourgeoisie and compel it to be more compliant in their negotiations with them.

Hence it follows that neither the Austrian nor Spanish Socialists could have pursued a *correct policy towards the peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie, i.e., they could not fulfill the third condition necessary for the victorious struggle against fascism.*

The urban petty bourgeoisie is a vacillating class. In the majority of cases it inclines towards the side that impresses it with its determination and strength. Like the peasantry, it

follows those who know where they are going, why they are going, what they want to achieve by going there, and what the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie can gain from it. But the party which is afraid of the working class achieving victory, which fears the revolutionary activity of the masses as its own shadow, can never lead the toilers to victory. And it is precisely because the Spanish Social-Democrats were afraid of the victory of the workers' and peasants' revolution in Spain, that, although in the government, they not only failed to insist on the big latifundia being transferred to the peasantry, but on the contrary, they suppressed the peasant movement for the seizure of these lands. That is why the sons of the peasants in the Spanish army did not actively support the Spanish workers in October; that is why the fascist agitation against the Republic carried on by Gil Robles meets with response among the Catholic peasant masses.

And now about the fourth condition: *vigilance towards fascism, the aiming of well-timed blows against it and the maintenance of the initiative in the struggle against fascism.* It is evident from all that has been said above that there was no vigilance towards fascism in Austria and Spain; there was a systematic lulling of this vigilance by calls upon the workers to remain "on the legal ground of the Constitution." There were no well-timed blows against fascism; there was an armed struggle under conditions least favourable for the proletariat and most favourable for the ruling classes. Social-Democracy surrendered initiative in the class battles to the bourgeoisie. This is what Social-Democratic leadership of armed struggles looks like.

But take another country where the armed struggle of the toilers has been going on, not for several days, but for several years; where there has never been a Social-Democratic Party and no strong Social-Democratic mass organizations; where the working class never had the long training and organization which the workers had in Spain, and particularly in Austria; where the working class itself is not large, and, numerically, is submerged in the peasant sea. And yet the workers and peasants of this country have for seven years victoriously repelled the attacks of the militarist reaction, have routed the armies of the enemy, have been arming themselves at his expense, are creating new Soviet regions and are achieving new successes, because *their struggles are being led by Communist-Bolsheviks.* I speak of that wonderful page in the

annals of modern colonial revolution, of the struggle for the Soviet power in China.

Chiang Kai-shek's six campaigns against the Red Army ended in military and political failure. And although in the autumn of 1934, the Chinese Red Army, surrounded on all sides by superior enemy forces, was obliged to abandon the Central Soviet Region of Kiangsi, today, units of the Red Army occupy large regions in six provinces of China : Szechwan, Kweichow, Kansu, Shansi, Hunan and Hupeh. Guerilla units are operating in the province of Kiangsi, which the regular troops of the Red Army had abandoned. The Red Army's fighting front extends 1,000 kilometers, and this, thanks to its fine manoeuvring ability, makes the Red Army almost invulnerable to the attacks of the enemy.

The fabulous march of the main forces of the Red Army under the command of Chu Teh and Mao Tse-tung from Kiangsi to Szechwan, a distance of three thousand kilometers, mostly at night, or in pouring rain, in order to avoid Chiang Kai-shek's heavy bombing planes, during which the Red troops had to cross inaccessible mountains and wide rivers, without pontoons, and without the necessary stores and transport facilities, testifies to its *high degree of class consciousness*, its super-human stamina and *fighting spirit* which no Chinese militarist army can break.

The successes of the Red Army are also evidence of the *inseparable ties* it has with the broad masses of the toilers of China, who render every possible assistance to the Red forces in their struggle against Chiang Kai-shek ; they are evidence of the correct tactics pursued by the Communist Party of China, which *links the struggle of the army with the mass people's movement*, one of the forms of which is the guerilla warfare carried on in the rear of the enemy ; they are evidence of the fact that the commanders of the Red Army skilfully utilize the antagonisms in the camp of the militarists ; they are evidence of a military strategy which does not allow initiative in military operations to pass to the enemy, but which, by well-timed counter-attack, repels his offensive and politically demoralizes him.

But the Soviet movement, which up to now has developed outside of the main industrial centres, is setting itself bigger tasks at the present stage of development of the Chinese revolution. The Communist Party of China is striving to make the Soviet movement the *political core of a united China* ; it

is striving to take the lead in the struggle of the masses of the people of the whole of China against Japanese imperialism, to establish effective contact in the struggle against the imperialist invaders with all the military groups which are prepared to defend their country against aggression. For the purpose of creating such a broad anti-imperialist front the Chinese Communists offer to enter into an agreement with any and every political or military group with a view to joint action against the imperialist invaders on the following conditions : *Cessation of military operations against the Red Army and the Soviet districts ; establishment of political liberties ; arming the people, and organizing a popular war against the imperialist conquerors.*

This program for the formation of an anti-imperialist front of struggle of the Chinese people proposed by the Communist Party of China is not a manoeuvre. It would be a crime to manoeuvre in connection with the defense of one's own people against imperialist pirates. One may manoeuvre against an enemy but not against a people whose national liberty and life the Communists are heroically defending. And if it is true that the Communists, and the Communists alone, have the right in all countries of the world to speak *in the name of the people*—for they alone are the *real friends of the people*, for they alone pay with their lives and liberty for the part they take in the cause of the people—then it is still more true in regard to the Chinese Communists who are the sons of a people who are more oppressed and suppressed by world imperialism than any other people in the world. The glorious deeds of the Chinese Communists and their program of national liberation are evidence of the profound understanding of the great political responsibility that the Chinese Soviets bear *before the whole people* who are fighting for national liberty, the profound understanding of the responsibility which the Communist Party of China bears *before the workers of the whole world* for the fate of the Chinese revolution. And only such a Bolshevik combination of the interests of one's people with the interests of the toilers of the whole world, only such a bold application of the people's anti-imperialist front, only the leadership of the Communist Party of China which has been tried and tested in the fire of battle, can push the Chinese revolution forward, emancipate the Chinese people from the yoke of imperialism, restore the integrity and unity of China and establish the Soviet power over the whole country.

VI. A CONGRESS OF A NEW TACTICAL LINE

THE experience of the struggle for the united front in France, the lessons of the armed struggles in China, Austria and Spain in the midst of the process of revolutionization of the working class, have stimulated the Communist International, at its Seventh Congress, to adopt a new tactical line.

It is said that in this connection all the opponents of the Communist International and the enemies of our movement rejoice and say: "The Comintern is changing its tactics."

What astonishing news! The tactics of a political party are not the spectacles of a musty keeper of archives who never takes them off, even when he goes to bed. Tactics, which are the sum total of the methods and means of struggle of a political party, are precisely intended to be changed if changed circumstances require it. We Communists are a live, active party, and not archive rats who fail to see the political and social changes that take place in the life of the people. We are not like the British diehards, for example, who obstinately repeat the slanderous fables about the U.S.S.R. although glaring facts daily refute their foolish fables. The Communists least of all want to resemble the wiseacre who in reply to the reproach that his arguments were contradicted by the facts, said: "All the worse for the facts!"

But, say our opponents, the new tactics of the Communist International contradict the old tactics. Well, even if they do, what's wrong with that? The tactics of the workers' party in imperialist wars, for example, "contradict" its tactics in national wars. Only hopeless pedants would now declare that the tactics of the workers' party in national wars were wrong. Right tactics become wrong tactics when they are applied in concrete historical conditions other than those for which they were intended.

Tactics remain correct for the period and for the conditions for which they were intended, even though they are unsuitable for the new conditions. That is why we emphatically repudiate the clumsy attempt of the reactionary section of the Social-Democrats to make it appear that the old tactical line of the Communist International was wrong. Was the Communist Party of Germany right in waging an irreconcilable struggle against the Social-Democrats when the bourgeoisie in Germany, with the aid of the Social-Democrats, carried on capitalist exploitation and ruled the country? It was absolutely right. Is

the Communist Party of Germany right today, when Social-Democracy as a political party is smashed and when the Social-Democratic workers are turning towards the position of the class struggle, in concentrating its fire on fascism as the bitterest enemy of the working class? Absolutely right. This is an obvious contradiction, is it not? But it is contradiction only in the minds of those who do not understand a scrape about the living dialectics of the class struggle.

And here is another contradiction: formerly, we are told, the Communists did not pursue a united front policy; now they are pursuing it. But if the Communists did not pursue a united front policy before, it was because the Social-Democrats systematically rejected every proposal for a united struggle. That is what happened in Germany on July 20, 1932, when, in retaliation to von Papen's dissolution of the Prussian government of the Social-Democrat, Braun, the Communists proposed that they and the Social-Democrats jointly call upon the masses to fight. That is what happened on January 31, 1933, when, on the eve of Hitler's accession to power, the Communists proposed to the Social-Democrats and to the reformist unions that a general strike be organized jointly. That is what happened in France, when, from 1922 onward, the Communist Party, on various occasions proposed a united front *twenty-six times* and met with a refusal each time. That is what happened to the proposal made by the Communist International on March 5, 1933, when the fascists seized power in Germany. That is what happened to the Communist International's appeal to the Second International on October 10, 1934, in connection with the events in Spain and the heroic struggle of the Asturian miners. This is what happened only the other day to the communication sent by the Communist Party of France to the British Labour Party inviting the latter to take the initiative in convening an international conference of all workers' organizations for the purpose of deciding on effective measures to combat the Ethiopian adventure. That is what happened... and because that happened there was no united front. And because this is still happening in most capitalist countries, the united front, which was started in France, cannot be extended. And because *it should not and will not happen*, the Communist International is changing its tactics. And if the Social-Democrats could oppose the united front in the past it was because the pressure of the working class in favour of united struggle was not sufficient. This will not happen in

the future, because the defeat suffered by the whole international working class as a consequence of the bankruptcy of the policy of German Social-Democracy is causing the proletarian masses of the whole world loudly to demand united action, and they are universally supporting the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

It is said that the *united front tactics* contradict the "*class against class*" tactics. But as Comrade Dimitrov has quite rightly said, the "*class against class*" tactics are not the tactics of the struggle of one section of the working class against another, but the tactics of mobilizing the forces of the proletariat as a class against another class—the bourgeoisie—on the basis of the united front. If in the preceding stage the "*class against class*" tactics were transformed into a struggle, not only against the bourgeoisie, but also against Social-Democracy, it was because Social-Democracy had entered into a bloc with the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary section of the working class, because it had coalesced with the apparatus of the capitalist state, had introduced the fascist type of arbitration in strikes, had undertaken police functions (Zoergiebel, Grzezinski, Severing), because after the general strike in Great Britain it had said: "Never again!" had supported the policy of Mondism, etc. And by still persisting in this policy so fatal for the working class, as in the Scandinavian countries, for example, Social-Democracy hinders the application of the "*class against class*" tactics on the basis of the united front. But the "*class against class*" tactics which the workers and their vanguard united in the Communist International want to apply do not preclude the united front; on the contrary, they presuppose it. That is how the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. conceived the "*class against class*" tactics. The resolution adopted in February, 1928, clearly speaks of the necessity of proposing a united front, both national and local, "in so far as considerable strata of the masses of the workers still follow the reformist leaders."

Such is our reply to our enemies. And now about the doubts expressed by our friends. Some think that the present attitude of the Communist International towards Social-Democracy is in crying contradiction to the position of Bolshevism, which throughout its history has waged a ruthless struggle against the Mensheviks. They argue as follows: "It is well known that the Bolsheviks fought against the conciliators who tried to unite the Mensheviks with the Bolsheviks. Is not the-

Communist International, with its unity of the working class movement slogan, slipping into the position of *conciliation* with the Mensheviks? The Bolsheviks did not win the masses by organizing a *united front* with the Mensheviks but by exposing the Mensheviks as agents of the bourgeoisie, and thereby won the workers away from the latter's influence. The Bolsheviks appealed *directly* to the masses and led their movement *without, and over the heads of, the Mensheviks*. Neither in 1905, nor in the years of reaction, nor in 1917 did the Bolsheviks *advance the slogan of a united front government*, and least of all did they advance the slogan of a *people's front*. How is it possible to do this now?"

It is true that Bolshevism fought against Menshevism, and against conciliation with it, as determinedly as the Communist Party of Germany, for example, fought against Brandler and the German conciliators. But it is also true that at various stages of its development Bolshevism fought the Mensheviks in various ways. In 1910, for example, the Bolsheviks entered into a bloc with the Party Mensheviks* for the purpose of fighting against the Right and Left liquidators. Did this bloc imply that the Bolsheviks laid down their arms before Menshevism, that the Bolsheviks began to adopt a conciliatory attitude towards the Mensheviks? Not in the least. By means of that bloc the Bolsheviks split the ranks of the Mensheviks, and, by helping one section of them to come over to the Party position, they struck a blow at Menshevism as a trend which served as the channel of bourgeois influence in the ranks of the proletariat. The fact that the Bolsheviks adopted a *different* approach towards different trends among the Menshevik Social-Democrats did not make them conciliators. The conciliators were those who obscured the principles underlying the disagreements between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, who called upon the Bolsheviks to cease their struggle against Menshevism on the ground that the latter was a "legitimate" trend in the working class movement, and who denied that Menshevism was harmful to the interests of the proletariat; they were the ones who actually tried to get Bolshevism to capitulate before Menshevism.

*Those Mensheviks who were in favour of preserving the underground Party organization during the period of reaction as against those who demanded the dissolution of the underground organization and the pursuit of purely legal activities.
—Ed.

Only downright scoundrels can assert that in fighting for the unity of the working class, the Communist International is obscuring the fundamental differences that divide the Communists from the Social-Democrats, i.e., the question of class collaboration, of the proletarian revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviet power, of defense of the bourgeois fatherland, etc.

It would be sheer madness to obscure these disagreements now that the bankruptcy of the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie is revealed, now that the whole progress of events has proved the correctness of the line of the Communist International, that the masses are turning to the Left precisely because their own experience has convinced them that the class struggle is necessary. Only hopeless idiots can think that by helping the Social-Democratic workers to come over to the position of the class struggle by means of the united front tactics we are facilitating the capitulation of Communism to Social-Democracy. If the Bolsheviks adopted a different approach towards the various trends of Menshevism in the years of reaction, there is still greater justification for the Communists doing this today in the capitalist countries when great changes are taking place in the ranks of the Social-Democratic workers, as well as in the ranks of the whole working class. Only by abandoning the view that Social-Democracy is one reactionary mass will the Communists be able actively to influence the process of revolutionization of the Social-Democratic workers, without waiting for a spontaneous turn towards Communism.

Moreover, it would be wrong to think that the working class movement in capitalist countries today, in the epoch of the incipient proletarian revolution, must traverse the same path of development, down to its minutest detail, that was traversed by Bolshevism, which took political shape under different historically concrete circumstances, from those that exist now. It must not be forgotten that in the pre-war working class movement the Russian Bolsheviks were the *first* party of the new type, which laid a road for itself without past experience and no precedents to go by. Since then, Bolshevism has become a world trend which has found its organizational embodiment in a world Bolshevik Party—the Communist International. Since then, Bolshevism, in conjunction with the working class, has conquered one sixth of the globe, and has acquired a mighty instrument for influencing the world

proletariat such as the *state of the proletarian dictatorship and the victorious construction of socialism*. Bolshevism's rich, thirty years' experience, which is accessible to the international working class movement, in its turn, shortens the latter's road compared with that traversed by Russian Bolshevism in the course of its development. That is why in applying the experience of the tactics pursued by the Russian Bolsheviks to the working class movement of today a "discount" must be allowed for the changed social-political situation.

Secondly, it will be impossible to understand the present tactics of the Communist International if the specific features of the working class movement abroad, which distinguish it from the Russian working class movement prior to October, 1917, are ignored. Social-Democracy has far deeper roots among the masses in modern capitalist countries than the Mensheviks had in Russia, for capitalism in those countries is stronger than Russian capitalism was. The working class in those capitalist countries is better organized than the Russian proletariat was before the revolution but it is organized in mass Social-Democratic Parties and in mass reformist trade unions. It received a long reformist, political and organizational training and became a conservative force which hindered the penetration of new ideas among the masses of the workers. In the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries Communism has not had the asset of revolutions (1905-07) in which Russian Bolshevism became steeled; it had, however, to overcome a very strong Social-Democracy and strong reformist trade unions.

In its advance among the masses, Communism could not avoid Social-Democracy and the reformist trade unions, nor could it exercise such direct influence upon the working class as Russian Bolshevism exercised upon the fresh, revolutionary human material it had to deal with, which had not yet become saturated with reformist influences. The spontaneous element plays a less important role in the mass movement in modern capitalist countries than it did in pre-revolutionary Russia, for example, where the reformist trade union movement was weak, and where the political and organizational positions occupied by the Mensheviks in the working class movement were weak.

In modern capitalist countries, however, it is not only the proletariat, but also other strata of the toiling population, that are better organized.

In those countries, the seeds of revolution have not fallen upon the virgin soil of the maturing agrarian revolution, as was

the case in Russia. Communism in those countries found a peasantry, and an urban petty bourgeoisie, among which the process of political differentiation had taken place, which were organized in various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, in various forms of co-operative societies, mutual aid societies, etc. It was extremely difficult for Communism to force its way directly to these allies of the working class over the heads of all these organizations. It would have been ridiculous, to say the least, to wait until all these organizations had automatically fallen to pieces so that the Communists could with their unsoiled hands collect the "deserted" masses which had abandoned all petty-bourgeois prejudices.

A revolutionary situation in which the masses change their views, and old organizations break down with amazing rapidity, does not yet exist in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries ; but neither do the masses regard the line of demarcation between the various political parties as rigidly as they have done up to now. The masses have now begun to move ; they are already *rebelli*ng against the bankrupt policies of their old organizations ; but *they are not yet prepared to abandon them*. They are, however, *bringing pressure to bear upon the leaders of their organizations* and are demanding a *different policy, based on the class struggle, and not on class collaboration*. They are demanding from their old leaders, who are as obstinate as bulls which refuse to leave their stalls, the establishment of unity of action in the struggle against capital among all organizations who want to fight against it. It is to this period in the growth of class consciousness and activity of all the toiling masses—who are on the road leading from the policy of class collaboration to the policy of class struggle, from supporting the bourgeoisie to supporting the proletariat, from reformism to Communism—that *the tactics of the united workers' front, which serves as the basis for the general people's front, correspond*.

Often, efforts are made to find historical analogies and parallels with the past. These are very valuable, but they will be of little use to us if we fail to grasp the vital thing in the specific features of the present world situation. Taking advantage of the crisis, capital has clutched the toilers by the throat in a deadly grip. The fight is such as has never before been witnessed in the history of the working class movement. Nor have we witnessed such a political regime, such a terrorist regime, as German fascism. The imperialist wars which the

bourgeoisie is preparing for the toilers will also be *fascist wars*, i.e., wars in which there will be no distinction between front and rear, between belligerent armies and peaceful populations, wars waged at a distance, wars waged with machinery, gas, and bacteria. No matter how zealously we search the pages of text-books on history, we shall not find in them a situation analogous to the present, in which revolution, war and fascism have become so interwoven in the development of mankind. Consequently, we must not base our tactics on analogies, but on a concrete analysis of the relation of class forces at the given moment.

Is the relation of class forces today such as enables us to say that the conditions have matured for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in modern capitalist countries? No. These conditions have not yet matured, because, in a number of countries the proletariat has not yet torn itself away from the influence of the bourgeoisie, nor has it thrown off the influence of Social-Democracy. In the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries the Communists are still too weak to lead the masses directly into the fight for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. The working class itself is split up, and, therefore, is unable to take the lead of the other strata of the toilers who in some countries are still inclining towards fascism. What would you want the parties which do not want to engage merely in *propaganda* for the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet power to do under such circumstances? Wash their hands and repudiate responsibility for the situation which the policy of the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy has led to?

But the working class is demanding much more from the Communists; it is calling upon them to say what it must do *today, with the present relation of forces*, in order to withstand the onslaught of capital, to save itself and its people from fascism, and to save itself and the whole of mankind from war.

The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., and the adoption of the position of the class struggle by the Social-Democratic workers, which has already begun, are transforming the Communists into a force which cannot rest content with merely the propagandist repudiation of capitalism, with merely criticizing the inadequate political maturity of the movement today. In order to utilize the growing power of the working class to the utmost, the Communists must actively intervene in the present

mass movement and strive to raise it to the level of the central task of the working class movement, viz., the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. That is why the Communists are now working unceasingly to restore the unity of the working class movement, the militant unity of the trade unions, political unity, as the fundamental condition for the successful struggle against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war; for without this concrete struggle of the present day, the fight for the proletarian revolution and for the proletarian dictatorship is impossible.

We are fighting to transfer the burdens of the crisis to the shoulders of the ruling classes, for the dissolution of fascism and the fascist movement (disarming the fascist gangs, expulsion of fascists from the state apparatus, dissolution of their organizations, suppression of their press, arrest of their leaders), for the restoration of the liberties of the working class and its organizations, for peace, and against war. But we Communists are practical revolutionaries, we know that the present bourgeois governments will not grant our demands. These demands, however, may be met as a result of the pressure brought to bear by the masses upon a government which can arise out of a powerful united front movement that will grow into a general people's front.

Such a government will not be a coalition government, a government of collaboration between Social-Democracy and the bourgeoisie. The coalition government was a government which fought against the Left wing of the working class. *The united front government, however, is the government of cessation of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, the government of collaboration between the workers' organizations which have severed the bloc with the bourgeoisie, the government which fights against fascism and not against the working class.* One government paved the way for the fascist dictatorship; the other government must pave the way for the victory of the working class.

Nor will this government be a Social-Democratic government like those which, as experience has shown (Great Britain, Sweden, etc.), have been pursuing the policy of the bourgeoisie, and not the policy of fighting the bourgeoisie, not the policy of fighting fascism. The united front government will be a government of the workers' organizations, a government of the people's front, a government consisting of representatives of the political

organizations of other classes which stand on a common platform with that of the workers' organizations to fight against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war. It will not be a government of normal times, but a government of the period of *political crisis*.

But the united front government will not be the government of the proletarian dictatorship ; it *should*, however, be a government that must prepare for the establishment of the power of the working class. It should be that. But whether it will be so, or not, depends on a number of things, and, primarily, on the solidarity of the working class, its fighting ability, its determination and readiness not to be satisfied with results achieved, but to push on with its offensive against the ruling class right up to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship.

Is it essential for us to pass through the stage of the united front, or people's front, government in order to establish the government of proletarian dictatorship ? No, it is not essential. Our tactics are not a cut and dried scheme into which we must artificially stick the whole development of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, without consideration for the variety of its conditions and forms. On the whole, the tactical line of the Seventh Congress corresponds to the *relation of class forces* in the present period, it corresponds to the *present level of the movement and strength of the Communist Parties*, as it is today, and will be in the immediate future. These are tactics calculated for a long time to come. Tactics, generally, may change, but the general line of the Communist International, *the course it is steering for the proletarian revolution, based on the welding of the forces of the working class remains unchanged*.

VII. A CONGRESS WHICH RALLIED THE FORCES OF THE COMMUNISTS ON THE BASIS OF THE CORRECT GENERAL LINE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL. A CONGRESS OF FRANK, BOLSHEVIK SELF-CRITICISM

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS confirmed the correctness of the general line of the Communist International. It was not the bourgeoisie, its scholars, its economists and its statesmen; it was not Social-Democracy, its theoreticians and its politicians, who proved to be right in their estimation of the world situation and of the prospects of development of the capitalist world; it was the Communists—who employ the unexcelled method of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in examining social phenomena—who proved to be right.

The bourgeois economists declared that an epoch of "eternal prosperity" had set in. The Social-Democrats talked about the epoch of "organized capitalism."

The Communists disagreed with this and said that since the World War of 1914-18 the capitalist world had entered into a period of general crisis.

Facts proved that the Communists were right.

Capitalist stabilization has been established forever, asserted the bourgeois and Social-Democratic "scholars."

Stabilization is relative; it is temporary and transient, retorted the Communists.

Facts proved that the Communists were right.

There will be no more crises. The capitalist world has entered the stage of non-crisis economy, was the forecast made by bourgeois and Social-Democratic science.

Under capitalism crises are inevitable, retorted the Communists.

The world economic crises which broke out in 1929 proved that the Communists were right.

The capitalist world is entering a period of subsiding class antagonisms, of the gradual improvement of the material conditions of the working class and the masses of the toilers, of the establishment of "socialism" by means of bourgeois democracy and social reforms—this is what the progressive bourgeois, and the reformists of all shades, thought.

The Communists thought differently. They said: the

world is not marching towards the abatement, but towards the unprecedented intensification, of class antagonisms. If the working class does not tear itself away from the influence of reformism and come over to the position of the class struggle, its conditions, and the conditions of all the toilers, will steadily grow worse under capitalism. Bourgeois democracy is not paving the way for socialism, but for fascism, and it is abolishing all the social gains that the working class has achieved by many years of struggle.

Events of the last few years proved that the Communists were right.

Kautsky said that in the epoch of "super-imperialism" the big states subordinate the weaker nations *economically*, and therefore there is no need for the former to wage wars. Imperialism becomes almost tame and peaceful.

To this the Communists replied: the imperialist stage of the development of capitalism is inseparably connected with the outbreak of new imperialist wars, more monstrous than any that have occurred up to now. If the proletariat is not able to overthrow the bourgeoisie, the Communists added, the bourgeoisie will drive the proletariat into the abyss of war.

Facts prove that the Communists, and not people of the type of Kautsky, were right. The Communists were right in the question of the proletarian revolution, in the question of the paths of development of the proletarian dictatorship, in the question of building socialism in the U.S.S.R.; they were right on all the fundamental problems of the world working class movement, which lay at the basis of the program, strategy and tactics of the Communist International, and which determined its Leninist-Stalinist general line.

Does this mean that the Communists were infallible in applying this correct line to the concrete conditions of the working class movement in the various countries? No, it does not mean that. We had many cases in which the correct line was distorted; these distortions were mainly of a sectarian character, and frustrated the Bolshevik mass policy of the Communist Parties.

The Seventh Congress struck hard at these distortions. There have not been many Congresses in the history of the Communist International at which there has been such stern Bolshevik self-criticism as there was at the Seventh Congress. It would be wrong to think that the Communists committed more mistakes in the period between the Sixth and Seventh

Congresses than in any other period of the development of the Communist International. What is true is that the Communist Parties have grown a head taller, that they have learned to appraise the path of their struggle more critically, and to see more clearly the "Left-wing disorders" of their growing and adolescent stage.

The Seventh Congress revealed weaknesses in the Communist movement which formerly the Communists failed to see, ignored. Take, for example, an ailment we suffer from such as the *mechanical* application of the experience of the Communist movement of one country to that of the Communist Parties in other countries. There is much here that we overlooked; we were unable to separate the tares from the wheat, and the "wheat" was the absolutely correct task of *internationalizing* the experience of our movement. But, while ostensibly carrying out this necessary and proper task, we often approached the problems of our movement mechanically and imposed the same tasks upon the weak Communist Parties as we imposed upon the stronger Sections of the Communist International. Not infrequently, we failed to take into account the specific features of the movement in the various countries, its political level, and the degree of its revolutionary maturity. And from this grew up the "tares," the mistakes.

Or take the question of Communists working in the fascist mass organizations. The Communist International cannot be reproached with not giving timely instructions on this question. But these instructions were too general; they should have been worked out more concretely. We shall make no progress by merely repeating commonplaces about it being necessary to work in the fascist mass organizations. The principal question is: *How is this work to be carried on?* This is not an easy task. Here two dangers lurk for the Communists: the danger of being crushed by the enemy at the very outset, or the danger of their adapting themselves to the conditions to such a degree as to degenerate into liquidators. We have not much experience to go by in this work yet, and it is a difficult matter to sum it up *publicly*; for although this would help to train our cadres, it may disclose our methods of work to the enemy, and thus help him in his struggle against the Communists.

The Bolsheviks' experience of underground work under tsarism is extremely valuable, but it does not help to solve entirely the problems which now confront the Italian and

German Communists, for example, who are working under conditions of exceptional terror. It must not be forgotten that fascism has another side besides the terrorist side; it has the side of social-demagogy, which stupid and incompetent tsarism did not have. It must not be forgotten that fascism learned from defeated tsarism how to prevent the Communists from "utilizing legal possibilities," that it has surrounded its mass organizations with an espionage system of such wide ramifications as the tsarist secret police never succeeded in organizing. It must not be forgotten that the whole apparatus of the modern capitalist state is ever so much stronger than the state apparatus of the tsarist autocracy. The underground experience of our Party is not sufficient to meet all our requirements today.

And yet, mental laziness, and an inclination to adopt stereotyped forms, prevented us from penetrating more deeply to the core of the subject. Instead of trying to understand the specific situation in which the Communists in fascist countries have to work, we preferred to explain everything by the fact that the Communists failed to carry out decisions.

And for years this explanation for the failure of our mass work in the fascist countries was accepted without noticing that the very explanation itself had become stereotyped. At the Seventh Congress, Comrade Dimitrov thoroughly trounced a number of cut-and-dried schemes, and he trounced this one too.

The Communist Parties in the fascist countries, and the Italian and German comrades in particular, will have to rack their brains quite a bit to work out the appropriate forms of Bolshevik work in the fascist mass organizations. In order to achieve success in this work it will be necessary to draw a more strict distinction between the "legal" and illegal work of the Communist Parties in fascist countries; more decentralization will have to be introduced so that the lower organizations may be less dependent upon higher organisations, while at the same time, the underground leadership of the Party will have to exercise more effective control over the comrades who are carrying on "legal" work in the fascist mass organizations. Organizational forms must be devised by which to develop the initiative of rank-and-filers engaged on open mass work; and cadres of "legal" workers in the revolutionary working class movement must be created who must penetrate into the fascist mass organizations. In short, we must decipher

the "Trojan horse" tactics referred to by Comrade Dimitrov. This work will give political training to a cohort of practical mass workers, of great practical revolutionaries, to whom will fall the great honour of overthrowing fascism.

The Congress also criticized our weaknesses in trade union work. On this question also the Communist Parties in the past have adopted excellent resolutions; but these have not been carried out. Why? Was it the evil intent of the Communists which prevented these resolutions from being carried out? Of course not.

The gulf between desire and deed was created because those who drew up the resolutions paid little attention to the real possibilities of carrying them out. Often these resolutions were something in the nature of a collection of general instructions applicable to the most favourable conditions for carrying them out. But concrete reality was altogether different; it created difficulty after difficulty in the work of the Communists in the trade unions: the Communists were expelled from the trade unions, they were discharged from the factories, they were strangled by the noose of unemployment, etc.

The conditions under which these resolutions were drawn up changed, but people kept on repeating the same old words, and thus the gulf between word and deed became wider. This disorganized the Party workers, taught them to treat adopted resolutions with insufficient respect, weakened their determination to fight even for easier and more modest tasks.

How much talk has there been about the need for Communist fractions in the trade unions? And yet no progress was made because, by forming our own small unions, we kept the Communists away from the masses, doomed them to stew in their own juice, doomed them to work where complete unanimity reigned, where fractions were a pure formality and their meetings sheer waste of time.

Put the Communists where they will come into daily contact with masses who are not yet ours, where they will have to answer the arguments of our opponents in the presence of the masses, where they will learn to argue and to defend our position, where they will acutely feel the need for a preliminary discussion and agreement among themselves and their supporters in order to withstand the attacks of the reformist bureaucracy. If you do that you will not recognize them as the people whom today we accuse of not being able to work in the trade unions. In addition to all other advantages, trade

union unity, for which the Communists are now fighting, has the advantage that it *creates the conditions* for the growth of our Communist cadres, for training real mass leaders.

But does this mean that in criticizing sectarian mistakes the Seventh Congress underestimated the danger of Right opportunism? No, it does not, comrades.

Large masses of Social-Democratic workers are beginning to turn towards Communism. They will add fresh power to our movement. In a number of fascist countries, in Austria, for example, they have already given the Communist Party good cadres whose fighting qualities are not inferior to the original Communist cadres. At the same time, we must not forget that the masses who are coming to Communism will not become Communists overnight. The complete elimination of Social-Democratic views requires time. The survivals of Social-Democratic ideology will continue for a time to burden the minds of the new Party members, and this increases the danger of Right opportunism.

This danger becomes all the more serious because we are on the eve of great shocks to the capitalist world, of a great turn in events, of big class battles, which people with insufficient political stamina and weak nerves will be unable to stand. Comrades, remember what Comrade Stalin told us about the fishermen who were caught in a storm. Some reefed their sails still closer, their boat cut through the waves, and they swept boldly forward in the teeth of the gale. Others, however, crouched in the bottom of their boat, covered their heads in fear and allowed themselves to be tossed about at the will of the waves. We want the Communist Parties to be fishermen of the Stalin school and not fishermen who fear the storm. That is why it is particularly necessary at the present time to increase our vigilance towards Right opportunism. Are there already fishermen of the Stalin type in the Parties of the Communist International? Yes, comrades, there are.

VIII. A CONGRESS OF MATURE BOLSHEVIK CADRES

THE BOLSHEVIKS in the capitalist countries have given us immortal examples of heroism. John Schœer, August Luetgens, Fiete Schulze, Chu Chu-po, Sallai, Furse, Iwata, Yosimitsi, Watanaba, Massanosuke, Lutibrodsky—scores and hundreds like them—people who from the scaffold issue their last call to the masses and hurl their last challenge at the enemy. With head proudly raised they marched, and are marching today, to the scaffold, filled with love for the people, hatred for the enemy, and contempt for death. In the dim light of dawn in capitalist towns and villages one hears the muffled steps of men and women going to their death; and every day these muffled steps rouse millions, rouse them to a similarly indomitable and fearless struggle. When the as yet triumphant hounds and hogs of capital say to a rank-and-file German Communist whom they have tormented and beaten nearly to death: "We have knocked Communism out of your head," they hear the reply from almost numbed lips: "You have knocked it in more deeply." And this unknown hero of the German people is right. Torture and execution are knocking Communism deeper into the hearts and heads of men and women. And the love and confidence of the masses of people towards the men and women of the Stalin stamp, towards those who are waging a life and death struggle against slavery and oppression, are growing and spreading all over the world.

The Communists have shown their mettle. They have shown that they cannot be exterminated any more than their class, its will to fight and to conquer, can be exterminated.

And day after day these people are mastering more and more the hidden secrets of Bolshevik science: the ability to establish strong, inseparable ties with the broadest masses; the ability to keep one's head at critical moments and quickly and independently find one's bearings even in the most difficult situation; the ability to combat vacillation and hesitation; the ability to observe Party rules and discipline.

And precisely because reliable Communist cadres have been and are growing up in the capitalist countries, the Congress very materially *changed the Communist International's method of leading its Sections*. The Congress emphasized the fact that the Executive Committee of the Communist International should concentrate more on working out the main political and tactical line, and that it should, as a rule, refrain from

interfering in the internal organizational affairs of the Communist Parties. This wise decision was not accidental; it was dictated by the fact that the Communist movement in the capitalist countries has become strong and Bolshevized.

A Bolshevik, Stalin guard has arisen in the lands of capital! And we are proud of the fact that from the ranks of this Stalin guard in the capitalist countries has arisen a man who hurled his bold challenge at the enemy even while the executioner's axe was hovering over his head, a man who by his courage gave a powerful impetus to the anti-fascist movement all over the world—I refer to the people's tribune, Georgi Dimitrov. When this indomitable revolutionary rose to his full Bolshevik height in his passionate struggle against fascism, the whole world realized the strength of Communism, the strength of the Stalin cohorts. It was to him that the Congress entrusted the helm of the Comintern. In electing the leadership of the Communist International the Congress elected those who will pursue the new tactical line, not merely out of consideration for discipline but because they are convinced it is a correct line; and because it was absolutely sure that with Georgi Dimitrov at the helm it will be a loyal, tried, steeled, Stalin leadership.

But the significance of the Bolshevik cadres which have grown up is not confined to organizational conclusions concerning the personnel of the leadership of the Communist International, or to the change in the methods of leadership. The existence of *strong Bolshevik cadres* is one of the *most important guarantees of the success* of the Communist Parties in their struggle for the proletarian revolution. The victory of the revolution depends not only on the objective conditions which facilitate it, but also on the men and women who make this revolution. It will be impossible to determine the prospects of our movement correctly if we do not take into account the state of the available cadres of the Communist Parties.

IX. A CONGRESS OF GREAT PROSPECTS

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS indicated *great prospects* for the world working class movement, *prospects of battles and victories*.

In this respect it met the requirements of the millions of workers who have tasted the bitter fruit of defeat, viz., it has pointed to the way out of the *cul-de-sac* into which the policy of Social-Democracy has led them. It has shattered the Social-Democratic legends about the omnipotence of capital and the impotence of the workers. It has smashed the fatalistic view that the standard of living of the masses must inevitably be reduced during a crisis, that fascism must inevitably be victorious, that a new series of imperialist wars is inevitable, i.e., that the triumph of the armed bourgeoisie and the defeat of the unarmed proletariat are inevitable.

The Congress, pointing to the experience of successful mass strikes in a number of capitalist countries, showed that even in the conditions of a crisis it is possible to hold up the capitalist offensive. Pointing to the living example of the anti-fascist struggle of the French proletariat, the Congress demonstrated to the whole of the international working class that by establishing a united workers' front, which grows into an anti-fascist people's front, it is not only possible to stand in the path of fascism, but even to start an offensive against it. In popularizing the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. which is supported by the anti-war struggle of the international working class, the Congress showed that more than once it has been possible by the united efforts of the U.S.S.R. and the toilers in the capitalist countries to frustrate the bellicose plans of imperialist governments. And finally, the Congress showed that the growing might of the Land of Soviets, of the first proletarian state of the world working class, gives the toilers in the capitalist countries the assurance that they, too, have at their command an important material force with which to face the bourgeoisie which is arming against them. *

The clear and distinct prospects outlined by the Seventh Congress are not those of waiting passively for the "spontaneous" development of events, not the line of capitulation based on the expectation of the automatic collapse of the fascist dictatorship, but prospects of struggle with increasing chances of victory. This victory is inevitable; but the road to it may be *less or more* arduous for the toilers. Of all the paths to victory, however, the most arduous will be that of the

continued split in the ranks of the working class, and inadequate activity of the toilers in the struggle against the ruling classes.

Even if the capitalist world succeeds in emerging from the present world economic crisis it will not remove the revolutionary prospects. Every improvement in the economic situation will be utilized by the working class in order to pass to the counter-offensive, in order to win back from capital their modest gains that were annulled by the bourgeoisie as a result of the world economic crisis. The proletariat will not become reconciled to the colonial level of existence, with the monstrous disfranchisement which the ruling classes have imposed upon it on the plea of saving capitalist economy from collapse. Everywhere a huge wave of strikes will break out which serve as the starting point for great popular movements against the reign of starvation, poverty and fascist terror. The living, striking example of the growing well-being of the masses of the people in the U.S.S.R. will have a particularly strong effect under such conditions.

What can the ruling classes put up against this example? Capitalism in its fascist cloak? But the ruling classes are greatly mistaken if they think that the establishment of the fascist dictatorship will take place in every capitalist country as smoothly as it took place in Germany. German fascism has upset the game of the fascists in other countries. By its bloody practices it has raised a wave of anger against fascism all over the world. The anti-fascist movement in France and the armed battles in Austria and Spain have shown the bourgeoisie in other countries that the attempt to establish the fascist dictatorship will meet with the stubborn resistance of the toilers. The bourgeoisie stands the risk of losing its head if it rushes headlong towards its goal. Its fight for fascism will be the starting point of great class battles which may end in the overthrow of capitalism.

At the same time, where the fascist dictatorship is already established, so much class hatred is accumulating against fascism that the revolutionary movement, even if its development encounters greater difficulties than in other countries, will assume the form of ruthless civil war.

Lenin wrote :

" The school of civil war does not leave the people unaffected. It is a harsh school. And its complete curriculum inevitably includes the victories of the counter-

revolution, the debaucheries of enraged reactionaries, the savage punishments meted out by the old governments to rebels, etc.... This school teaches the oppressed classes how to conduct civil war, how to bring about a victorious revolution; it concentrates in the masses of present-day slaves the hatred which is always harboured by the down-trodden, dull, ignorant slaves, and which leads those slaves who have become conscious of the shame of their slavery to great historic exploits.*

The bankruptcy of fascist policy is becoming more and more evident to those masses which supported the fascists before they came into power. The peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie are displaying increasing dissatisfaction with their position. A large section of the big bourgeoisie is alarmed by the approaching economic catastrophe. The social base of fascism is shrinking more and more. At the same time, the success of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. has been exercising, and will continue to exercise, a revolutionizing influence, not only on the proletariat, but also on the petty-bourgeois masses which have been the social prop of fascism. Crises in the fascist dictatorship, like the Matteotti crisis in Italy and that of June 30 in Germany, are not only inevitable, but, on the basis of past experience, will be utilized more and more actively by the masses in order to strike a decisive blow against fascism. Never in history has terrorism saved regimes that were doomed to collapse.

And the Land of Soviets, against which German fascism intends to mobilize the whole capitalist world, will grow and become stronger, and will win the peoples to the side of socialism in spite of the frenzied bourgeoisie. If the capitalist world leaves the Land of Soviets in peace, if it refrains from attacking it and allows it to develop for several years, this land, by its achievements, will convince millions of people all over the world of the advantages of socialism over capitalism. It will transform the "peaceful" people who are outside of all politics into anti-capitalist revolutionaries; it will transform yesterday's opponents of socialism into its ardent friends who will be willing to lay down their lives in order to achieve its triumph, it will attract to socialism the best human minds, the flower of the nations and peoples, and the oppressed masses of all races and all colours.

* Lenin, "Inflammable Material in World Politics", *Selected Works*, Volume IV, p. 298.

Socialism would not be the great all-conquering idea that is being realized on one-sixth of the globe if it did not possess the mighty power of setting mankind in motion. And it is precisely because socialism needs no wars for its triumph, that the world proletariat and its state, the U.S.S.R., are the most consistent and sincere fighters for the cause of peace. And precisely because capitalism is doomed, the bourgeoisie is trying to save this system, which has become a shame and a curse to mankind, by new imperialist wars, and primarily by an attack on the Land of Socialism, the fatherland of the toilers, the U.S.S.R.

But an attack on the Land of Socialism will unleash the forces of the proletarian revolution. And, as Comrade Stalin has said, as a result of such a war the bourgeoisie will miss some of its governments. Let the capitalist world dig its own grave! The working class has no reason to be pessimistic about the future. It will fulfil its function of grave-digger of the capitalist system under any circumstances. And it was with this conviction that the whole of our Congress, the Congress of the impending victories of the working class, the Congress of preparation for these victories, was imbued.

The Seventh Congress laid down a distinct and clear course for the masses; it demonstrated the correctness of the line of the proletarian revolution. We have a world Communist Party which will pursue this course and carry out this line, i.e., the Communist International, the International of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. We have the guarantee that this course will be properly pursued and this line carried out in the general staff of the Communist International, guided by its great steersman, Comrade Dimitrov. We have the guarantee of victory in the fact that the army of toilers of all countries is being led by the great leader of all the exploited and oppressed, Comrade Stalin.

Long live the Seventh Congress of the Communist International!

Long live the great Stalin!

AFTER THE MUNICH CONSPIRACY

(From the Pravda of Nov. 7, 1938)

At the present time, when the Soviet people, freed from capitalist slavery, celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of the great Socialist revolution which inflicted a crushing blow on the first world imperialist war, millions of people in the capitalist countries are falling victims to sanguinary fascist brigandage. The fascist miscreants are driving mankind towards the abyss of a new imperialist war.

Long before the present events, Comrade Stalin repeatedly uttered the warning that the fascist governments were preparing a new imperialist carnage. In January 1934, from the tribune of the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, COMRADE STALIN declared :

“Again as in 1914, the parties of bellicose imperialism, the parties of war and revenge, are coming into the foreground. Quite clearly things are moving towards a new war.”
(See Stalin, report at Seventeenth Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union).

Subsequently, on March 1, 1936, in a talk with Roy HOWARD, Comrade STALIN stated :

“In my opinion there are two seats of war danger. The first is in the Far East, in the zone of Japan. I have in mind the numerous statements made by Japanese military men containing threats against other powers. The second seat is in the zone of Germany.... At present the Far Eastern seat of danger reveals the greatest activity. However, the centre of this danger may shift to Europe.”

Guided by this Marxist-Leninist analysis, the *Seventh Congress of the Communist International* characterised the plans of plunder of German Fascism in the following way :

“The adventurist plans of the German fascists are very far-reaching and count on a war of revenge against France,

dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, annexation of Austria, destruction of the independence of the Baltic States, which they are striving to convert into a base for attack on the Soviet Union, and the wresting of the Soviet Ukraine from the U.S.S.R. They are demanding colonies and are endeavouring to stir up sentiment in favour of a world war for a new repartition of the world." (See resolution on the tasks of the Communist International in connection with the preparations of the imperialists for a new world war. Section one.)

The entire course of events has shown how correct the Communists were when they sounded the alarm regarding the oncoming danger of war and issued the timely call to the working people to resist fascism on the basis of a united Popular Front.

In 1935, Italy attacked Abyssinia. Fascist Germany, in its turn arbitrarily tore up the Versailles Treaty, introduced conscription, militarised the Rhineland and transformed it into a military base from which to strike a blow at France. Then it forcibly occupied Austria, seized the Sudetenland, took possession of all the military-strategic positions of Czechoslovakia, achieved its dismemberment in the endeavour to transform Czechoslovakia into its virtual colony.

In summer of 1936, Germany and Italy, having first provoked a fascist *putsch*, organised armed intervention against the Spanish Republic. For two years Italian airmen and German artillerymen have been reducing Spanish towns to ruins, slaughtering Spanish women and children, trampling the soil of the Spanish people, whose only wish is to be masters in their own home.

A no less nefarious war for the conquest of China is being waged by the Japanese fascist-militarists in the Far East against the Chinese people fighting for its independence.

All these facts go to show that the second imperialist war has in fact already begun. It has begun surreptitiously, without war being declared. States and peoples have somehow imperceptibly crept into the orbit of the second imperialist war. War has been begun in different parts of the globe by three aggressive states, the fascist ruling circles of Germany, Italy and Japan. War is being waged over a tremendous expanse from Gibraltar to Shanghai. War has already succeeded in drawing over five hundred million people into its orbit.

In the last analysis it is being waged against the capitalist interests of Britain, France, the U.S.A., since its object is to

secure the repartition of the world and spheres of influence to the advantage of the aggressive countries and at the expense of these so-called democratic states.

"The distinctive feature of the second imperialist war is, for the time being, that it is being waged and developed by the aggressive powers, while the other powers, the 'democratic' powers against whom in fact the war is directed pretend that the war is no concern of theirs, wash their hands of it, back out of it, laud their own peaceableness, rail at the fascist aggressors and step by step yield their own positions to the aggressors, at the same time asserting that they are preparing to resist" (See the new "Short Course of the History of the C.P.S.U." Pages 3, 18-19, Russian Edition.)

Why has this series of sanguinary fascist crimes become possible? It has become possible because the ruling circles of the so-called democratic states have systematically retreated before the fascist aggressors.

Italian fascism was allowed to attack Abyssinia with impunity. It not only enslaved Abyssinia, but also hurled itself against Spain. German fascism was permitted to militarise the Rhineland without hindrance. It made use of this to fall upon Spain, engulfed Austria and crushed Czechoslovakia. The Japanese freebooters were enabled to seize Manchuria and the Northern provinces of China. With growing insolence the Japanese militarists embarked upon a war to conquer the whole of China. Step by step the countries of "Great Western Democracy" retreated before the fascist plunderers. Step by step the fascist plunderers strengthened their positions.

Yet the Governments of the bourgeois-democratic countries possessed adequate means wherewith to avert the outbreak of war. They were in a position to curb the fascists aggressors by the joint action of the states, members of the League of Nations interested in maintaining peace. They were in a position to do so by employing article 16 of the League of Nations Covenant, which provides for collective action against violators of the peace. They were in a position to do so by applying economic sanctions, which would inevitably have compelled the Governments of Germany, Italy, Japan, which do not possess adequate resources of raw materials, to retreat in face of the resolution of those who are interested in the maintenance of the peace. Such action to secure the maintenance of peace would have met with enthusiastic support.

of all peoples, who want neither the bondage of fascism nor the horrors of war. A powerful movement of the peoples would have been the most effective means against the instigators of war.

However, the bourgeois Governments did not put the system of collective security into operation. They did not do so because they did not want to. They did not do so because their policy is determined by the reactionary imperialist circles, who, out of fear of the growth of the working class movement in Europe, of the movement for national liberation in Asia, out of hatred for the land of Socialism sacrificed to fascism the interests of their own people. They supported German fascism because they want in its person to have a European gendarme that strangles every democratic anti-fascist movement of the masses of the people. In the name of their narrow class imperialist interests they yield the small nations to be rent asunder by fascism, thereby facilitating the further aggression of the fascist Governments.

So as to arrive at agreement with German fascism the haughty ringleaders of these imperialist circles not only did not spare the prestige of the "Great Powers" they represent, but also underwent such personal humiliation at the hands of fascist dictators as though they were speaking on behalf of countries already defeated in war.

And vain are their endeavours to cover up their terrible responsibilities to the peoples by their lying equivocations to the effect that by bending the knee to the fascist dictators, they were saving the cause of peace, were saving Europe and mankind from the horrors of war.

II.

At all the stages at which war was unleashed, only the great Soviet Union pursued a firm policy of peace. Had the other states accepted the proposals of the Soviet Government regarding a collective repulse to the aggressor, peace would have been preserved. Millions of people would not have been hurled, as now, into the bloody shambles of destruction by war.

During the onslaught on Abyssinia, the Soviet Union as distinct from other countries, consistently operated the economic sanctions established by the League of Nations in relation to fascist Italy. From the very beginning of the military intervention against the Spanish Republic, the Soviet Union dec-

lared for resolute collective action by all the countries belonging to the League of Nations, against the German and Italian violators. On more than one occasion the Soviet country came out against the policy of so-called non-intervention, which in fact, meant the application of a blockade to Republican Spain and has enabled the interventionists to introduce their troops and military supplies for the annihilation of the Spanish people, and get off scot-free.

When the Italian pirates began to sink merchant ships in the Mediterranean the Soviet Government resolutely demanded an end to the piracy and brought about the conclusion of the well-known Nyon agreement which was directly aimed at the protection of peaceful merchant navigation. At the assembly of the League of Nations and in its commissions, in the Non-Intervention Committee and in all other bodies, only the Soviet Union has unreservedly defended the just cause of the Spanish peoples.

At the Brussels Conference, summoned in connection with the onslaught of the Japanese militarists on China, the Soviet Union insisted on the operation of a policy for the collective repulse of the Japanese invaders. The Chinese people know that it has in the Soviet peoples its unswerving friend, the advocate of the sovereignty, integrity and independence of China.

When German fascism moved its troops into Austria, the Soviet Union proposed to the Governments of the other states that they take joint action against the arbitrary conduct of the fascists.

Everybody is aware of the position adopted by the Soviet Union when German fascism was brandishing the knife over Czechoslovakia, when the Polish and Hungarian vultures fastened their teeth into the living body of the Czechoslovak people. In accordance with the agreement concluded with Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union declared before the whole world that it was ready to come to the assistance of Czechoslovakia should the latter be attacked, and would fulfil its obligations as provided for in this treaty. The Soviet Government also warned Poland that an attack by it on Czechoslovakia would entail the automatic cancellation of the non-aggression pact between Poland and the Soviet Union.

The whole world knows how the Soviet Union answered the invasion of Soviet territory at Lake Hassan by the Japanese Samurai. By a crushing lightning blow at the Japanese

provocateurs, the army of the land of Socialism showed how to employ armed force to guard the cause of peace.

The Soviet Union pursues its policy in the interests of the genuine defence of peace, in the interests of the working people of all countries. Its peace policy corresponds to the aspirations of all peoples. The Soviet Union is the powerful buttress of the struggle against wars of conquest, the unfailing defender of small nations and weak countries against fascist aggression and imperialist enslavement. The land of Socialism is the staunch bulwark of the liberation struggle of the working people throughout the world, the most important factor in rallying the forces of the international working class and of the anti-fascist People's Front.

In its struggle for peace, the Soviet Union bases itself on the might of victorious Socialism. Every new Socialist factory is a new fortress in the struggles of the peoples of all countries against fascism. Every flourishing collective farm is a new blow at the dark forces of reaction. Every success of the Socialist country strengthens the power of the working people throughout the world. The culture and science of the Soviet country are placed at the service of the whole of mankind. The moral and political unity of the Soviet people increases the great vital force of international solidarity among the working people.

Amid the general confusion and uncertainty as to the morrow that reign in the capitalist world, only the Soviet people looks calmly into the future. Steadfastly and confidently the Soviet Union is completing the construction of Socialist society and advancing to Communism.

Every day brings to the working people of the capitalist world ever new proofs of the correctness of the path being followed by the great Soviet people under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. The entire tremendous struggle of the Party of Lenin-Stalin for Socialism for the Socialist industrialisation of the country, for the collectivisation of peasant farming, the struggle against the host of enemies, the rooting out of the Trotskyite-Bukharinite agents of fascism in the U.S.S.R.—all this is increasingly assuming its place in the minds of the international working class as their very own cause, the cause they hold most dear.

The whole of working mankind is vitally interested in the all-round consolidation of the Soviet Union, in the resolute strengthening of contacts between the great Soviet people and the working class and peoples of the capitalist countries. Here—

in lies the most important guarantee of the successful struggle for world peace.

III.

It would be a most dangerous delusion at the present time for the labouring masses and the people to believe the false pro-fascist legend that it has been peace that has been secured at the price of the predatory dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, that German fascism has by this act of violence completed the fulfilment of its programme of aggression in Europe and that the peoples may sleep in tranquility without grievous thoughts about a new war. Only accomplices in the fascist crimes, only deceivers of the peoples or hopeless political blockheads can spread such a legend. No person in his right senses will deny that it is precisely since the Munich conspiracy that the effrontery of the fascist aggressors has immensely increased. And it could not be otherwise, for German fascism has been presented by the reactionary British and French bourgeoisie with new, exceptionally favourable military-strategic and economic positions for the further development of imperialist war. Now the question has already passed beyond the bounds of the arbitrary revision of the Versailles treaty by the fascist states.

What is at issue is a new repartition of the globe. What is at issue is not only the distribution of the existing colonial possessions, but the repartition of Europe itself, the colonisation of a number of European states and the imperialist enslavement of a number of European peoples.

The fascist beasts-of-prey themselves do not consider it necessary to conceal the course of their plunderous endeavours. The map circulated by the fascists after the occupation of the Sudetenland clearly demonstrates the plans of German fascism. It turns out that according to the schedule outlined in this map the spring of 1938 was to see settled the fate of Austria; the autumn of 1938 of Czechoslovakia; the spring of 1939 is to see a blow struck at Hungary; in the autumn of 1939 the object of plunder is to be Poland; preparations are being made for a blow in the spring of 1940 at Yugoslavia; in the autumn of 1940—at Rumania and Bulgaria. In the spring of 1941—France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland are to be the object of a fascist onslaught; in the autumn of 1941 fascist Germany plans its attack on the U.S.S.R. Further, we learn from this

map that German fascism magnanimously places at the disposal of fascist Italy a big part of Spain, the southern districts of France, Greece, a big part of Turkey, Syria, Palestine and North Africa.

It suffices to observe the disruptive work of German and Italian fascism in the British and French possessions to become convinced that the fascists are really working to put these plans into operation. German fascism is engaged in furious disruptive activity in Alsace Lorraine. On France's Pyrenean frontier the German fascists are engaged in intensive activity to establish bases for a blow at France. Fascist agents are inflaming separatist movements among the Slovaks and Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia, are conducting disruptive work in Yugoslavia, Rumania, in the Balkans. They are preparing the next blow against Lithuania and the other Baltic states. The Polish fascists, who have flung themselves like jackals on the river body of Czechoslovakia and are baring their teeth at Lithuania, are themselves, by their policy of plunder, subjecting the independence of Poland to the menace of a blow from the insatiable hand of German fascism.

But the Fascist plunderers are reckoning without the host. The peoples have not yet said their decisive word.

Never yet, since the end of the world imperialist war, has the hatred felt for the warmongers been so profound and strong as at the present time. A wave of popular indignation against the vile deeds of fascism is rising in all countries. The movement to repulse the fascist aggressors found clear expression in days when the plotters in Munich were tearing to pieces and sacrificing to fascism the cultured, democratic Czechoslovak Republic. Millions of people rose in its defence in the most important countries of the world. In Great Britain, for many days without a break, big meetings took place which demanded the defence of Czechoslovakia. Members of the biggest trade unions, social organisations, representatives of the intelligentsia, outstanding public figures came forward with the demand for a collective repulse to the fascist gangsters. They insisted on Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union uniting their forces to aid Czechoslovakia. Very influential British newspapers published tens and hundreds of letters from their readers protesting against the betrayal of Czechoslovakia by the British bourgeoisie. Thousands of such protests were sent to newspaper editors. The Executive Committee of the Co-operative Party, speaking on behalf of five million members,

demanding of the British Government that it call Parliament together and come to the aid of Czechoslovakia.

After the return of the British National Council of Labour delegation from Paris, where a conference took place with the leaders of the French trade unions, several thousand mass meetings took place throughout Great Britain, directed against the policy of bowing and scraping to German fascism. The protest movement grew with every day that passed.

In the United States of America, despite the resistance of pro-Fascist circles which proclaim the policy of so-called isolationism the movement in support of Czechoslovakia attained particularly big dimensions. Representatives of organisations of twenty-one nationalities (Czechs, Slovaks, Serbs, Rumanians and others) sent messages to the President of the U.S.A., demanding that the Kellogg Pact be fulfilled, and that the system of collective security be put into operation in defence of Czechoslovakia. Similar demands were put forward by representatives of social, trade union and other organisations, and by many outstanding men of science and culture. In a number of towns in the United States "Save Czechoslovakia" Committees were established. The meetings, organised to protest against the new onslaught by fascist Germany, attracted enormous numbers of people. In some of the biggest centres of the country (Chicago) huge demonstrations, took place, in each of which hundreds of thousands of people took part.

In France a wave of indoor and outdoor meetings, of demonstrations against the Munich agreement, is taking place throughout the country. Not only trade union and public organisations, but also authoritative military circles have declared the need for supporting Czechoslovakia.

Even in such countries as, for example, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Poland, where the fascist regime exists, the masses of the people found ways and means of expressing their sympathies for Czechoslovakia and of coming forward in its defence against German onslaught. Thousands of people expressed their desire to join the Czechoslovak Army as volunteers. The Czechoslovak embassies in the European capitals received an enormous number of letters containing expressions of these sentiments.

From distant Australia, representatives of the trade unions addressed the Czechoslovak people with a promise of aid in case of war with Germany.

The popular movement attained particularly big dimensions

after the Munich agreement. The masses are increasingly realising the real meaning of the policy of the ruling cliques, which is directed towards retreating before fascism. The smoke-screen created by the pro-fascist circles and their representatives in the ruling sphere, directly assisted by a number of reactionary leaders of the Second International and of the International Federation of Trade Unions, and designed to convince people that peace was saved in Munich, is beginning rapidly to disperse.

IV.

Two basic trends can be observed in international politics.

(1) The further conduct of the policy of agreement between German and Italian fascism on the one hand, and the imperialist cliques of Great Britain and France on the other ; an agreement directed against the vital interests of their own peoples, against the poorly protected nations and countries, against the international labour movement, against democracy, against the great land of Socialism.

(2) The movement of the working-class united front, of the united front of the peoples against this bandit agreement, against fascist aggression, in defence of world peace.

The first trend leads to the division and enslavement of Spain and China, to the enslavement of independent peoples, to the intensification of colonial slavery, to the further unleashing of imperialist war.

The second trend leads to the victory of the Spanish and Chinese peoples over the fascist plunderers, to the consolidation of the liberty and independence of the small nations, to the curbing of the fascist aggressors, and to the guaranteeing of world peace.

There can be no doubt that it is precisely this second trend that corresponds to the interests of the working class and of the peoples of all countries. But for it to triumph, it is necessary that reaction at home be curbed in the lands of bourgeois-democracy, that the policy of capitulation to the fascist aggressors be stopped ; governments are necessary that base themselves on the masses of the people, that reckon with their interests and their wishes, governments that are ready to fight against the fascist enemy from without.

The most important lesson of the recent events is precisely that, unless the reactionary imperialist cliques and capitulators

in one's own country are curbed, it is impossible to curb the unbridled fascist brigands, it is impossible to conduct a successful struggle in defence of the liberty and independence of the people and to defend world peace.

The working class and its Communist vanguard is the most resolute and consistent adherent and champion of peace. But this does not at all imply that it stands for peace at any price, that it stands for handing over its own people and its country to the fascist vultures "in the interests of peace." He who desires the establishment of real and durable peace must employ all possible forces and means to fight against fascist plunderers and enslavers, and resolutely cast aside capitulators and accomplices of the fascist aggressors, who deceive the people with their false pacifist homilies.

The defence of world peace, the defence of the people against armed fascist aggression, cannot be achieved by wordy pacifist declarations and invocations. What is needed is active struggle, resolute resistance. The onslaught of armed fascism must be countered by the mailed fist of the peoples.

What basic tasks face the international working class and the working masses of all countries in the light of the events taking place? These tasks may be briefly reduced to the following :

To frustrate the policy of the bandit agreement between the fascist aggressors and the imperialist clique of Britain and France ;

To offer resolute resistance in the countries of bourgeois-democracy to reaction which is raising its head and is aimed at the social achievements of the working people, at democratic liberties, at the labour movement ;

To ensure the victory of the Spanish and Chinese peoples over the fascist vultures ;

To protect the Czechoslovak people and the people of the small countries against foreign enslavement. 6

Forces that are quite real exist for the solution of these tasks. All that is necessary is that they be brought into action.

It would be difficult in post-war political history to find another moment when the interests of the working class, peasantry, petty-bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, when the interests of the small nations, of the dependent and colonial countries, when the interests of culture and science, the interests of peace and democracy, coincided and merged in a common current against fascism, the worst enemy of mankind,

such as the present moment. *This is quite a real basis for the establishment and consolidation of the united front of the working class and of the peoples of all countries against fascist barbarism and the incendiaries of imperialist war.*

The decisive role in the establishment of powerful united front against fascist aggression and brigandage belongs to *the international working class*. The entire course of historical development brings the working class forward as the initiator, organiser, leader of the front of resistance by the peoples to the fascist plunderers.

The working class is the most advanced class and the paramount force of modern society. Its vanguard unit has won victory on a sixth part of the earth over the dark forces of capitalism, and has built up a new, socialist society. The international working class is supremely interested in finally smashing the chains of capitalist slavery and exploitation throughout the world. It is the most irreconcilable enemy of reaction and fascism, the most resolute and consistent fighter against all oppression and enslavement of peoples, against all kinds of wars of plunder.

Constituting the backbone of its people, possessing the enormous advantage of its decisive role in the productive life of the country, the advantage of its numbers, of its concentrated and organised character, the working class is the staunchest bulwark of the liberty and independence of the country.

The working class is the only class in modern social society that is armed with the most advanced science of Marxism-Leninism, with the great teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin that illumine the path of struggle against the forces of reaction, fascism and war.

All this places an historic responsibility on the working class. If it is to fulfil its role of initiator, organiser and leader of the common front of all the anti-fascist forces of the world, *it must realise its own strength and be able to make use of this enormous strength to rally together the masses of the working people*. It must become profoundly imbued with the consciousness of the need resolutely to take the lead of the popular movement against fascism.

But for the working class to rally together and consolidate the popular movement against fascism, it must first and foremost, *establish unity in its own ranks in the struggle against the common enemy*. The opponents of the working-class unity, the opponents of the anti-fascist popular front, whoever they

may be, whatever the masks behind which they conceal themselves, must be ruthlessly exposed and ousted as accomplices of reaction at home and of the fascist aggressors.

At the present exceptionally responsible moment one must not limit oneself to the mere propagation of working-class unity.

Today already unity must be established in practice, sweeping aside all obstacles in its path. There are quite a number of people who are not averse to talking about the benefits of unity, but who do nothing themselves to bring it about. It would be naive to think that united action by the working class on a national and international scale is possible without a tireless struggle to bring it about. One must not delude oneself that working-class unity can be brought about without a struggle against its opponents in the ranks of the labour movement itself, against the enemies of the land of Socialism, against the bearers of bourgeois influence into the ranks of the proletariat, against the Trotskyites and all sorts of other agents of fascism.

The entire international situation imperatively demands that the international working class, despite the existence yet in their midst of various ideological viewpoints and party-political trends, find a common language as soon as possible in the struggle against fascism, and operate a single international policy that bars the way to the fascist plunderers and incendiaries of war, and guarantees the cause of peace between the peoples. The fulfilment of the idea that is maturing in the ranks of the labour movement regarding the calling of an international workers' conference of representatives of the organisations of the working class of all countries, would be an exceptionally important practical step on this road. Such a conference is necessary for the defence of Spain, China, the social gains of the working class and democratic liberties, so as to rally together all the forces of the international proletariat against fascism's Munich conspiracy.

There cannot be insurmountable obstacles to the achievement of united action by the international working-class movement that is so necessary.

....The fascist aggressors are beating the drums regarding their "Munich victory." They are making furious preparations for new bandit conspiracies and crimes. They are helped in this by the worst enemies of the working class and of Socialism in the bourgeois-democratic countries. Men of little

faith, capitulators, cowards bow their heads before fascist jack-boots.

But the fascists are celebrating prematurely. Their "victory" is a *pyrrhic victory*, a victory which is fraught with defeat for them. They have engulfed Austria, but seven millions of the Austrian people hate them. They have seized the Sudetenland, but have roused the wrath of the peoples of Czechoslovakia to the uttermost limits against themselves. They have crushed Czechoslovakia, but have roused all small nations against themselves. They are shedding the blood of the Spanish people, but twenty million Spaniards pronounce the name of the German interventionists with anathema.

The fascists, by their effrontery, are rousing the whole world against themselves. By their brigandage they are generating the most profound indignation of advanced mankind. By their conquests they are undermining the ground beneath their own feet. And the hour of vengeance will come. A united working class, together with the genuinely democratic forces of the peoples, are in a position to curb the fascist violators and warmongers, and together with their own peoples to crush fascism.

There are not, nor can there be, such forces in the world as can turn the wheel of historical development back. The future belongs not to rotten declining capitalism and its poisonous foul-smelling cesspool—Fascism; but to ascending socialism, towards which are turned the eyes of all working people, of the whole of mankind.

SOVIET FIGHTS FOR PEACE AGAINST THE INSTIGATORS OF WAR

*(From the Report of Stalin on the Work of the Central
Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the
C. P. S. U. (B.). Delivered
March 10, 1939.)*

COMRADES, five years have elapsed since the Seventeenth Party Congress. No small period, as you see. During this period the world has undergone considerable changes. States and countries, and their mutual relations, are now in many respects totally altered.

What changes exactly have taken place in the international situation in this period? In what way exactly have the foreign and internal affairs of our country changed?

For the capitalist countries this period was one of very profound perturbations in both the economic and political spheres. In the economic sphere these were years of depression, followed, from the beginning of the latter half of 1937, by a period of new economic crisis, of a new decline of industry in the United States, Great Britain and France; consequently, these were years of serious political conflicts and perturbations. A new imperialist war is already in its second year, a war waged over a huge territory stretching from Shanghai to Gibraltar and involving over five hundred million people. The map of Europe, Africa and Asia is being forcibly re-drawn. The entire post-war system, the so-called regime of peace, has been shaken to its foundations.

For the Soviet Union, on the contrary, these were years of growth and prosperity, of further economic and cultural progress, of further development of political and military might, of struggle for the preservation of peace throughout the world.

Such is the general picture.

Let us now examine the concrete data illustrating the changes in the international situation.

1. NEW ECONOMIC CRISIS IN THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES—INTENSIFICATION OF THE STRUGGLE FOR MARKETS AND SOURCES OF RAW MATERIALS AND FOR A NEW REDIVISION OF THE WORLD.

The economic crisis which broke out in the capitalist countries in the latter half of 1929 lasted until the end of 1933. After that the crisis passed into a depression, and was then followed by a certain revival, a certain upward trend of industry. But this upward trend of industry did not develop into a boom, as is usually the case in a period of revival. On the contrary, in the latter half of 1937 a new economic crisis began which seized the United States first of all and then England, France and a number of other countries.

The capitalist countries thus found themselves faced with a new economic crisis before they had even recovered from the ravages of the recent ones.

This circumstance naturally led to an increase of unemployment. The number of unemployed in capitalist countries, which had fallen from thirty millions in 1933 to fourteen millions in 1937, has now again risen to eighteen millions as a result of the new economic crisis.

A distinguishing feature of the new crisis is that it differs in many respects from the preceding one, and, moreover, differs for the worse and not for the better.

Firstly, the new crisis did not begin after an industrial boom, as was the case in 1929, but after a depression and a certain revival, which, however, did not develop into a boom. This means that the present crisis will be more severe and more difficult to cope with than the previous crisis.

Further, the present crisis has broken out not in time of peace, but at a time when a second imperialist war has already begun; at a time when Japan, already in the second year of her war with China, is disorganising the immense Chinese market and rendering it almost inaccessible to the goods of other countries; when Italy and Germany have already placed their national economy on a war footing, squandering their reserves of raw material and foreign currency for this purpose; and when all other big capitalist powers are beginning to reorganise themselves on a war footing. This means that capitalism will have far less resources at its disposal for a normal way out of the present crisis than during the preceding crisis.

Lastly, as distinct from the preceding crisis, the present crisis is not a general one, but as yet involves chiefly the economically powerful countries which have not yet placed themselves on a war economy basis. As regards the aggressive countries, such as Japan, Germany and Italy, who have already reorganised their economy on a war footing, they, because of the intense development of their war industry, are not yet experiencing a crisis of overproduction, although they are approaching it. This means that by the time the economically powerful, non-aggressive countries begin to emerge from the phase of crisis, the aggressive countries, having exhausted their reserve of gold and raw material in the course of the war fever, are bound to enter a phase of very severe crisis.

This is clearly illustrated, for example, by the figures for the visible gold reserves of the capitalist countries.

VISIBLE GOLD RESERVES OF THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

(In Millions of former gold dollars)

			End of 1936	September 1938
Total	12,980	14,301
U. S. A.	6,649	8,126
Great Britain	2,029	2,396
France	1,769	1,435
Holland	289	595
Belgium	373	318
Switzerland	387	407
Germany	16	17
Italy	123	124
Japan	273	97

This table shows that the combined gold reserves of Germany, Italy and Japan amount to less than the reserve of Switzerland alone.

Here are a few figures illustrating the state of crisis of industry in the capitalist countries during the past five years and the trend of industrial progress in the U.S.S.R.

VOLUME OF INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT COMPARED WITH 1929

(1929=100)

	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
U. S. A. ..	66.4	75.6	88.1	92.2	72.0
Great Britain ..	98.8	105.8	115.9	123.7	112.0
France ..	71.0	67.4	79.3	82.8	70.0
Italy ..	80.0	93.8	87.5	99.6	96.0
Germany ..	79.8	94.0	106.3	117.2	125.0
Japan ..	128.7	141.8	151.1	170.8	165.0
U. S. S. R. ..	238.3	293.4	382.3	424.0	477.0

This table shows that the Soviet Union is the only country in the world where crises are unknown and where industry is continuously on the upgrade.

This table also shows that a serious economic crisis has already begun and is developing in the United States, Great Britain and France.

Further, this table shows that in Italy and Japan, who placed their national economy on a war footing earlier than Germany, the downward course of industry already began in 1938.

Lastly, this table shows that in Germany, who reorganised, her economy on a war footing later than Italy and Japan, industry is still experiencing a certain upward trend—although a small one, it is true—corresponding to that which took place in Japan and Italy until recently.

There can be no doubt that unless something unforeseen occurs, German industry must enter the same downward path as Japan and Italy have already taken. For what does placing the economy of a country on a war footing mean? It means giving industry a one-sided, a war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population, restricting to the utmost the production—and, especially, the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis.

Such is the concrete picture of the trend of the new economic crisis in the capitalist countries.

Naturally, such an unfavourable turn of economic affairs could not but aggravate relations among the powers. The

preceding crisis had already mixed the cards and intensified the struggle for markets and sources of raw materials. The seizure of Manchuria and North China by Japan, the seizure of Abyssinia by Italy—all this reflected the acuteness of the struggle among the powers. The new economic crisis must lead, and is actually leading, to a further sharpening of the imperialist struggle. It is no longer a question of competition in the markets, of a commercial war, of dumping. These methods of struggle have long been recognised as inadequate. It is now a question of a new redivision of the world, of spheres of influence and colonies, by military action.

Japan tried to justify her aggressive actions by the argument that she had been cheated when the Nine-Power Pact was concluded and had not been allowed to extend her territory at the expense of China, whereas Britain and France possess vast colonies. Italy recalled that she had been cheated during the division of the spoils after the first imperialist war and that she must recompense herself at the expense of the sphere of influence of Britain and France. Germany, who had suffered severely as a result of the first imperialist war and the Peace of Versailles, joined forces with Japan and Italy, and demanded an extension of her territory in Europe and the return of the colonies of which the victors in the first imperialist war had deprived her.

Thus the bloc of three aggressor States came to be formed.

A new redivision of the world by means of war became imminent.

2. AGGRAVATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SITUATION—COLLAPSE OF THE POST-WAR SYSTEM OF PEACE TREATIES—BEGINNING OF A NEW IMPERIALIST WAR.

Here is a list of the most important events during the period under review which mark the beginning of the new imperialist war. In 1935 Italy attacked and seized Abyssinia. In the summer of 1936, Germany and Italy organised military intervention in Spain, Germany entrenching herself in the North of Spain and in Spanish Morocco, and Italy in the South of Spain and in the Balearic Islands. Having seized Manchuria, Japan in 1937 invaded North and Central China, occupied

Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai and began to oust her foreign competitors from the occupied zone. In the beginning of 1938 Germany seized Austria, and in the autumn of 1938 the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia. At the end of 1938 Japan seized Canton, and at the beginning of 1939 the Island of Hainan.

Thus the war, which has stolen so imperceptibly upon the nations, has drawn over five hundred million people into its orbit and has extended its sphere of action over a vast territory, stretching from Tientsin, Shanghai and Canton, through Abyssinia, to Gibraltar.

After the first imperialist war the victor states, primarily Britain, France and the United States, had set up a new regime in the relations between countries, the post-war regime of peace. The main props of this regime were the Nine-Power Pact in the Far East, and the Versailles Treaty and a number of other treaties in Europe. The League of Nations was set up to regulate relations between countries within the framework of this regime, on the basis of a united front of states, of collective defence of the security of states. However, three aggressive states, and the new imperialist war launched by them, have upset the entire system of this post-war peace regime. Japan tore up the Nine-Power Pact, and Germany and Italy the Versailles Treaty. In order to have their hands free, these three states withdrew from the League of Nations.

The new imperialist war became a fact.

It is not so easy in our day to suddenly break loose and plunge straight into war without regard for treaties of any kind or for public opinion. Bourgeois politicians know this very well. So do the fascist rulers. That is why the fascist rulers decided, before plunging into war, to frame public opinion to suit their ends, that is, to mislead it, to deceive it.

A military bloc of Germany and Italy against the interests of England and France in Europe? Bless us, do you call that a bloc! "We" have no military bloc. All "we" have is an innocuous "Berlin-Rome axis"; that is, just a geometrical equation for an axis. (*Laughter.*)

A military bloc of Germany, Italy and Japan against the interests of the United States, Great Britain and France in the Far East? Nothing of the kind! "We" have no military bloc. All "we" have is an innocuous "Berlin-Rome-Tokyo triangle"; that is, a slight penchant for geometry. (*General laughter.*)

A war against the interests of England, France, the United

States? Nonsense! "We" are waging war on the Comintern, not on these states. If you don't believe it, read the "anti-Comintern pact" concluded between Italy, Germany and Japan!

That is how Messieurs the aggressors thought of framing public opinion although it was not hard to see how preposterous this whole clumsy game of camouflage was; for it is ridiculous to look for Comintern "hotbeds" in the deserts of Mongolia, in the mountains of Abyssinia, or in the wilds of Spanish Morocco (*Laughter*).

But war is inexorable. It cannot be hidden under any guise. For no "axes," "triangles," or "anti-Comintern pacts" can hide the fact that in this period Japan has seized a vast stretch of territory in China, that Italy has seized Abyssinia, that Germany has seized Austria and the Sudeten region, that Germany and Italy together have seized Spain—and all this in defiance of the interests of the non-aggressive states. The war remains a war; the military bloc of aggressors remains military bloc; and the aggressors remain aggressors.

It is a distinguishing feature of the new imperialist war that it has not yet become universal, a world war. The war is being waged by aggressor states, who in every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive states, primarily England, France and the U.S.A., while the latter draw back and retreat, making concession after concession to the aggressors.

Thus we are witnessing an open redivision of the world and spheres of influence at the expense of the non-aggressive states, without the least attempt at resistance, and even with a certain amount of connivance, on the part of the latter.

Incredible, but true.

To what are we to attribute this one-sided and strange character of the new imperialist war?

How is it that the non-aggressive countries, which possess such vast opportunities, have so easily, and without any resistance, abandoned their positions and their obligations to please the aggressors?

Is it to be attributed to the weakness of the non-aggressive states? Of course, not! Combined, the non-aggressive, democratic states are unquestionably stronger than the fascist states, both economically and in the military sense.

To what then are we to attribute the systematic concessions made by these states to the aggressors?

It might be attributed, for example, to the fear that a revolution might break out if the non-aggressive states were to

go to war and the war were to assume world-wide proportions. The bourgeois politicians know, of course, that the first imperialist world war led to the victory of the revolution in one of the largest countries. They are afraid that the second imperialist world war may also lead to the victory of the revolution in one or several countries.

But at present this is not the sole or even the chief reason. The chief reason is that the majority of the non-aggressive countries, particularly England and France, have rejected the policy of collective security, the policy of collective resistance to the aggressors, and have taken up a position of non-intervention, a position of "neutrality."

Formally speaking, the policy of non-intervention might be defined as follows: "Let each country defend itself from the aggressors as it likes and as best it can. This is not our affair. We shall trade both with the aggressors and with their victims." But actually speaking the policy of non-intervention means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war, and consequently, transforming the war into a world war. The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work: not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, "in the interests of peace," and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.

Cheap and easy!

Take Japan, for instance. It is characteristic that before Japan invaded North China all the influential French and British newspapers shouted about China's weakness and her inability to offer resistance, and declared that Japan with her army could subjugate China in two or three months. Then the European and American politicians began to watch and wait. And then, when Japan started military operations, they let her have Shanghai, the vital centre of Britain's monopoly influence in South China; they let her have Hainan, and they allowed her to surround Hongkong. Does not this look very much like encouraging the aggressor? It is as though they

were saying : " Embroil yourself deeper in war ; then we shall see."

Or take Germany, for instance. They let her have Austria, despite the undertaking to defend her independence ; they let her have the Sudeten region ; they abandoned Czechoslovakia to her fate, thereby violating all their obligations ; and then began to lie vociferously in the Press about " the weakness of the Russian army," " the demoralisation of the Russian air force," and " riots " in the Soviet Union, egging the Germans on to march farther east, promising them easy pickings, and prompting them: " Just start war on the Bolsheviki, and everything will be all right." It must be admitted that this too looks very much like egging on and encouraging the aggressor.

The hullabaloo raised by the British, French and American press over the Soviet Ukraine is characteristic. The gentlemen of the press there shouted until they were hoarse that the Germans were marching on Soviet Ukraine, that they now had what is called the Carpathian Ukraine, with a population of some seven hundred thousand, and that not later than this spring the Germans would annex the Soviet Ukraine, which has a population of over thirty million, to this so-called Carpathian Ukraine. It looks as if the object of this suspicious hullabaloo was to incense the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible grounds.

It is quite possible, of course, that there are madmen in Germany who dream of annexing the elephant, that is, the Soviet Ukraine, to the gnat, namely the so-called Carpathian Ukraine. If there really are such lunatics in Germany, rest assured that we shall find enough strait-jackets for them in our country. (*Thunderous applause*). But if we ignore the madmen and turn to normal people is it not clearly absurd and foolish to seriously talk of annexing the Soviet Ukraine to this so-called Carpathian Ukraine? Imagine: The gnat comes to the elephant and says perkily: " Ah, brother, how sorry I am for you....Here you are without any landlords, without any capitalists, with no national oppression, without any fascist bosses. Is that a way to live? ...As I look at you I can't help thinking that there is no hope for you unless you annex yourself to me....(*General laughter*). Well, so be it: I allow you to annex your tiny domain to my vast territories...." (*General laughter and applause*).

Even more characteristic is the fact that certain European

and American politicians and pressmen, having lost patience waiting for "the march on the Soviet Ukraine," are themselves beginning to disclose what is really behind the policy of non-intervention. They are saying quite openly, putting it down in black and white, that the Germans have cruelly "disappointed" them, for instead of marching farther east, against the Soviet Union, they have turned, you see, to the west and are demanding colonies. One might think that the districts of Czechoslovakia were yielded to Germany as the price of an undertaking to launch war on the Soviet Union, but that now the Germans are refusing to meet their bills and are sending them to Hades.

Far be it from me to moralise on the policy of non-intervention, to talk of treason, treachery and so on. It would be naive to preach morals to people who recognise no human morality. Politics is politics, as the old, case-hardened bourgeois diplomats say. It must be remarked, however, that the big and dangerous political game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in a serious fiasco for them.

Such is the true face of the prevailing policy of non-intervention.

Such is the political situation in the capitalist countries.

3. THE SOVIET UNION AND THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

The war has created a new situation with regard to the relations between countries. It has enveloped them in an atmosphere of alarm and uncertainty. By undermining the post-war peace regime and overriding the elementary principles of international law, it has cast doubt on the value of international treaties and obligations. Pacifism and disarmament schemes are dead and buried. Feverish arming has taken their place. Everybody is arming, small states and big states, including primarily those which practise the policy of non-intervention. Nobody believes any longer in the unctuous speeches which claim that the Munich concessions to the aggressors and the Munich agreement opened a new era of "appeasement." They are disbelieved even by the signatories to the Munich agreement, Britain and France, who are increasing their armaments no less than other countries.

Naturally, the U.S.S.R. could not ignore these ominous events. There is no doubt that any war, however small, started by the aggressors in any remote corner of the world constitutes a danger to the peaceable countries. All the more serious then is the danger arising from the new imperialist war, which has already drawn into its orbit over five hundred million people in Asia, Africa and Europe. In view of this, while our country is unswervingly pursuing a policy of preserving peace, it is at the same time doing a great deal to increase the preparedness of our Red Army and our Red Navy.

At the same time, in order to strengthen its international position, the Soviet Union decided to take certain other steps. At the end of 1934 our country joined the League of Nations, considering that despite its weakness the League might nevertheless serve as a place where aggressors can be exposed, and as a certain instrument of peace, however feeble, that might hinder the outbreak of war. The Soviet Union considers that in alarming times like these even so weak an international organisation as the League of Nations should not be ignored. In May 1935 a treaty of mutual assistance against possible attack by aggressors was signed between France and the Soviet Union. A similar treaty was simultaneously concluded with Czechoslovakia. In March 1936 the Soviet Union concluded a treaty of mutual assistance with the Mongolian People's Republic. In August 1937, the Soviet Union concluded a pact of non-aggression with the Chinese Republic.

It was in such difficult international conditions that the Soviet Union pursued its foreign policy of upholding the cause of peace.

1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.

2. We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighbouring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet State.

3. We stand for the support of nations which are the vic-

tims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders.

Such is the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. (*Loud and prolonged applause*).

In its foreign policy the Soviet Union relies upon :

1. Its growing economic, political and cultural might ;
2. The moral and political unity of our Soviet society ;
3. The mutual friendship of the nations of our country ;
4. Its Red Army and Red Navy ;
5. Its policy of peace ;
6. The moral support of the working people of all countries, who are vitally concerned in the preservation of peace ;
7. The good sense of the countries which for one reason or other have no interest in the violation of peace.

The tasks of the Party in the sphere of foreign policy are :

1. To continue the policy of peace and of strengthening business relations with all countries.
2. To be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them ;
3. To strengthen the might of our Red Army and Red Navy to the utmost ;
4. To strengthen the international bonds of friendship with the working people of all countries, who are interested in peace and friendship among nations.

DIMITROV

THE WAR AND THE WORKING CLASS

THE COMMUNIST ANALYSIS COME TRUE

THROUGHOUT all the years following the first world imperialist war, the Communists, basing themselves on the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, incessantly explained to the working people that capitalism by its very nature gives rise to wars, that the contradictions between the imperialist countries were not eliminated by Versailles and by the other imperialist peace treaties, but, on the contrary, that these contradictions would break out after some time with new and still greater force. Lenin taught that wars are the inevitable accompaniment of imperialism. The plunder of foreign lands, the conquest and spoliation of colonies, the seizure of markets serve as the cause of wars between the capitalist states. Comrade Stalin repeatedly uttered these warnings regarding the danger of a new imperialist war and disclosed the causes giving rise to it. In his report at the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) in 1930, he said :

“The bourgeois states are furiously arming and re-equipping their forces. What for? Of course, not for a friendly talk, but for war. The imperialists need war because it is the only means of dividing the world afresh, dividing anew the markets, sources of raw materials and spheres for capital investment.”

In a talk with Roy Howard on March 1, 1936, Comrade Stalin stressed the point that the chief cause of wars lies in capitalism, in its imperialist predatory manifestations. “He said at that time : “You remember how the first world war arose. It arose out of the desire to redivide the world. Today we have the same background. There are capitalist states which consider that they were cheated in the previous re-distribution of spheres of influence, territories, sources of raw materials, markets, etc., and which would want another redivision that

would be in their favour. Capitalism in its imperialist phase is a system which considers war to be a legitimate instrument for settling international disputes, a legal method in fact, if not in law." The events of the recent period completely confirm the correctness of these far-sighted warnings uttered by Comrade Stalin. They also testify to how correct the Communists were when they pointed out that the peoples would, in the very nearest future, be hurled into the flames of war, if the international working class should fail, by its united and resolute militant actions, to curb in time the instigators and provokers of war. They also testify to how timely were the tenacious efforts of the Communist International, directed towards the establishment of a powerful fighting front against war.

BRITAIN ENTERS THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

The Second Imperialist War, which began with the onslaught on the peoples of Abyssinia, Spain and China, has now developed into a war between the biggest capitalist states. The war has been transferred to the heart of Europe, and threatens to become a world slaughter. In its character and essence, the present war is, on the part of both warring sides, an *imperialist, unjust war*, despite the fraudulent slogans being employed by the ruling classes of the warring capitalist states in their endeavour to hide their real aims from the masses of the people. The character of a war, as Lenin taught, "depends not on who attacked and on whose side the 'enemy is' but on, *which class is waging the war, what policy is being continued by the given war.*" Now, as in 1914, the war is being waged by the imperialist bourgeoisie. The war is the direct continuation of the struggle between the imperialist Powers for a new re-partition of the earth, *for world domination*. Only the blind can fail to see, and only out-and-out charlatans and deceivers can deny, that the present war between Britain and France on the one hand, and Germany, on the other, is being waged for colonies, sources of raw materials, for domination over sea routes, for the subjugation and exploitation of foreign peoples. As is well-known, Great Britain has a huge empire with a colonial population of 480,000,000, while France possesses colonies inhabited by 70,000,000 people. Germany, which as a result of the first imperialist war was deprived of its colonies, is now putting forward claims for a division of colonial

booty in the hands of the British and French imperialists. The bourgeoisie of England and France, however, have no intention of letting their huge possessions slip out of their hands. They want to hold undivided sway over hundreds of millions of colonial slaves, to maintain their imperialist positions, to ensure the possibility of new conquest, to enfeeble their rival and to place it in a position of dependence on them. Herein lies the essence of the present war. *The clash of arms between the warring states is for hegemony in Europe, for colonial possessions in Africa and in other parts of the globe, for oil, coal, iron, rubber, and not at all in defence of "democracy," "liberty," "international law," and the guarantee of the independence of small countries and peoples* as is being howled by the bourgeois press and the social-democratic deceivers of the working class.

BOTH "NEUTRALS" AND "BELLIGERENTS" SHARE WAR RESPONSIBILITY

The interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie also determine the position of the majority of the capitalist states not directly participating in the war. Their neutrality policy is hypocritical through and through and above all is this true of the neutrality of the biggest capitalist state the U.S.A. The American bourgeoisie did not lift a finger when Japan attacked China. What is more, they are in actual fact the chief contractors of war supplies to Japanese imperialism. Under the flag of neutrality, the American imperialists are inflaming war in the Far East so as to enfeeble Japan and China, and then, basing themselves on their might, to dictate their conditions to the belligerent countries and to firmly establish themselves in China. Under the flag of neutrality, the American bourgeoisie are encouraging the further inflammation of the European war, becoming in fact an arms factory for Great Britain and France and raking in enormous war profits at the expense of the blood of the peoples of the warring countries. They are aiming to drive their rivals out of the world markets, to strengthen their imperialist positions and to consolidate their domination on the seas and oceans. Just as hypocritical in character is the neutrality of the other non-belligerent capitalist countries. Their bourgeoisie are doing everything to pile up as big profits as possible out of the war. Therefore even if they stand for peace for their own country, they encourage

war between the other states. They use their neutrality as a commodity with which to haggle, endeavouring to sell it to the highest bidder. Many of these neutral states, and above all, Italy, are waiting for the time when, as the war goes on, the chances of victory for one side or the other become clear, so as to take the side of the strong, and to dig their teeth into the vanquished and to tear away their share of the booty. Thus the position both of the belligerent and of the "neutral" states shows with the utmost clarity that *the responsibility for the war lies with the bourgeoisie of all capitalist countries and primarily with the ruling circles of the belligerent states.*

THE ROLES ARE REVERSED

Two stages can be clearly discerned in the course of the Second Imperialist War. In the first stage, Italy, Germany and Japan came forward directly as aggressor states. They took the offensive, while the other capitalist states England, France and the U.S.A. retreated, in the endeavour to avoid a decisive clash with their rivals and to turn their expansion in another direction, against the Land of Socialism. Now, on the other hand, the imperialists of Britain and France have passed over to the offensive, have hurled their peoples into war against Germany, endeavouring in every way to win a number of other states to their side. Whereas previously the above-mentioned European states were divided into aggressor and non-aggressor powers, i.e., into such as were directly the war-makers, and such as for the time being did not come out openly as aggressors, although behind the scenes, they encouraged aggression against other countries, now this division does not correspond to the real position. This difference has disappeared. What is more, *it is the British and French imperialism who now come forward as the most zealous supporters of the continuation, and further incitement to war.*

THE APPEASEMENT POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

What has given rise to this change in the position of the chief imperialist rivals, a change of very substantial significance from the point of view of understanding the events now taking place? As is well known, present day Germany grew up on the basis of slogans of revenge against Versailles and of being the shock troops of international reaction against "world

Bolshevism," against the U.S.S.R. The national-socialist regime received every kind of support from British and French imperialism, precisely so that it could fulfil its "historic" anti-Bolshevik mission. It made wide use of the constant concessions made by Britain and France and taking the law into its own hands, liquidated the Versailles Treaty, created an armed force, laid its hands on Austria, Czechoslovakia and Memel and won certain positions in Spain. *As long as the British and French imperialists hoped to turn Germany's expansion eastwards, they in every way encouraged its aggressive strivings, doing this at the expense of other peoples under the flag of the "non-Intervention" policy.* They renounced collective security and transformed the League of Nations—their own creation—into a laughing stock. They also accepted with great satisfaction the conclusion of the much noised "Anti-Comintern" pact between Germany, Italy, and Japan and the establishment of the so-called Berlin-Rome-Tokyo "triangle." The culminating point of this policy was the well-known deal at Munich, from whence the heads of the British and French Governments returned home as the "saviours of peace," exultant that they had at length succeeded in turning the aggression of Germany against the U.S.S.R.

SOVIET MIGHT SMASHES THE APPEASERS' DREAMS

But by that time the Soviet Union constituted a gigantic force. Rallied around the tested and victorious Party of Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet people, by successfully fulfilling two huge five-years plans, established a powerful Socialist industry, carried through the transfer of small peasant economy to the path of Socialism, and achieved the consolidation of the collective farm system. On this basis, there was guaranteed the indestructible defensive capacity of the Land of Socialism, resting on the moral and political unity of its people, on the splendidly equipped Red Army and the most profound Soviet patriotism. By the construction of Socialist society and by its wise Stalinist peace policy, the Soviet Union immeasurably increased its importance on the international arena and won tremendous confidence and love among the masses of the people of all countries, including Germany itself. Therefore when, in the opinion of the imperialist, a suitable moment had arrived for Germany to fulfil its role as shock troop against the U.S.S.R., Germany could not make up its mind to do so,

it had firstly to reckon with the economic and military might of the Soviet Union and with the moral unity and solidarity of the Soviet peoples, ready to defend their Socialist country to the last drop of blood and capable of crushing any enemy ; secondly the rulers of Germany were compelled to take account of the fact that they would fail to rally the majority of the German people to a war against the great Land of Socialism. In such a state of affairs, Germany was faced with the dilemma—*either* to fall into the position of underling of British and French imperialism, to go to war against the Soviet Union and risk its neck in this war ; *or*, to make a decisive turn in its foreign policy and to take the path of peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. As the facts show, the leaders of Germany selected the second path. At the same time, the ruling circles of Britain and France, on their part, while spending months of negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for the alleged purpose of establishing a common front against aggression, were in actual fact using every means possible to prevent this front from being established. Until the very last moment of the negotiations, they did not in the least give up their striving to bring Germany and the Soviet Union into collision. This is also confirmed, by the way, by the "White Paper" published by the British Government itself regarding the negotiations between the British Ambassador, Neville Henderson and Hitler on the eve of the German-Polish war. But the British and French imperialists miscalculated. *They staked on an anti-Soviet war but lost.*

THE GERMAN-SOVIET TREATY—TURNING POINT

The Soviet Union, operating a *Socialist foreign policy*, by concluding a Non-Aggression Pact with Germany, frustrated the insidious plans of the provokers of war, ensured peace between the two biggest states in Europe and strengthened its influence *over the entire course of international development. After the conclusion of the German-Soviet treaty, the bourgeoisie of Britain and France, no longer having any hope of war by Germany against the U.S.S.R., turned to the path of armed struggle against their chief imperialist rival. They did this under the pretext of defending their vassal-reactionary landlord Poland—the very Poland which the British and French imperialists had established as an outpost against the Land of the Soviets and by whose hands they wanted in 1920 to strangle the young Soviet Republic. The very same Poland whose po-*

tentates deprived Lithuania of Vilna and who not so long ago tore a piece out of the territory of Czechoslovakia. *They staked on Poland but here also they lost.* The Polish State, which constituted a prison of peoples with its regime of reaction and terror, oppression and plunder of millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and Polish working people themselves, at the very first military blow disclosed all its internal rottenness and fell to pieces in some two weeks.

SOVIET POLICY SAFEGUARDS PEACE AND AIDS SOCIALISM

In these conditions, the Soviet Union, pursuing its own independent policy, a policy dictated by the interests of socialism which coincide with the interests of the working people of all lands, undertook resolute measures to ensure peace throughout the East of Europe. By the entry of the Red Army into West Ukraine and West Byelorussia, the Soviet people rendered aid to their brothers groaning under the yoke of the Polish gentry, extricated 13,000,000 working people from sanguinary slaughter, emancipated them from capitalist slavery, opened up before them the road to a happy life and secured them freedom of national and cultural development. By concluding the German-Soviet "Amity and Frontier" Treaty, the U.S.S.R. not only eliminated the immediate danger of war for its peoples but also created a barrier against the extension of the imperialist war. By concluding mutual assistance pacts with the small Baltic countries, which were constantly menaced with falling victim to the big imperialist states, the U.S.S.R. established the guarantee of their national independence and secured their defence against imperialist aggression and strengthened the defensive capacity of its own country. The transfer of the city of Vilna and the Vilna region to Lithuania once again clearly shows the exceptional attention displayed by the Land of Socialism towards the national interests of small people. There never has been nor is there today in the world any state other than the Soviet Union that has, of its own accord, ceded a whole region to a small people living on its borders, out of regard for the national interests of this people. At a time when imperialist war is raging in Europe, when the bourgeoisie are inflaming chauvinism, inciting one nation against another, the Soviet Union establishes good neighbourly relations with the surrounding states, being guided in this policy,

by the Stalinist policy of peace and friendship of nations. By its entire policy, the U.S.S.R. is rendering an inestimable service to the cause of world peace, in which the peoples of all lands are interested.*

WAR-MONGERS IN ANTI-FASCIST CLOAK

But the imperialists of Great Britain and France, having taken the path of war, do not want to leave it. On the contrary, they are dragging the peoples further and further on to the fields of battle, covering up in every way the real character of the war. With this end in view, they are setting into motion all the means of the ideological deception of the masses. The older generation of workers who experienced the first world imperialist war well remember how at that time the press of Britain and France sought day in and day out to prove that the governments of these countries were waging war only in "defence of the fatherland" against "Prussian militarism"; while the German press in its turn sought to convince people that the war was being waged against "Russian Tsarism". In actual fact, however, as is well-known, what was taking place was a struggle between two groups of imperialists for the repartition of the earth. Now the ruling classes of Britain and France who today as, at that time, are pursuing imperialist aims, have altered the means and slogans of ideological deception in accordance with the situation of today. Speculating on the anti-fascist sentiments of the masses, they put forward the slogan of "anti-fascist" war and proclaim that their war against Germany is a "war of democracy against fascism," a war against "Hitlerism," a war for the freedom of nations.

HOW THEY DEFEND DEMOCRACY

But what fine apostles of "anti-fascist" war these are, who for so many years gave every indulgence to those against whom they are fighting today, and disrupted the united front of the peoples' struggle against fascism and war, when the entire international situation advanced this struggle as the most important task of the moment. What fine "fighters for the freedom of nations" these are, who for centuries have kept millions of colonial slaves in bondage and who play with the fate of small nations as bargaining counters in their imperialist deals! What fine "defenders of democracy" these are who in

their own countries are destroying the last remnants of the democratic rights of the popular masses, closing down their newspapers, removing their elected representatives and persecuting all who raise their voice against the present anti-popular war. The French bourgeoisie is now reviving the blackest days of counter-revolutionary terror. Since the days of the sanguinary suppression of the Paris Commune, France has not experienced such a drive of reaction against the working class. The banning of the Communist Party of France, the arrest of the revolutionary representatives of the French proletariat in parliament—the most consistent fighters against reaction of every kind—serves as a clear proof of how false and hypocritical are the declarations regarding the democratic anti-fascist character of the war. *The reactionary bourgeoisie hurls itself against the Communists because it fears the truth about the war more than fire, because the Communist Party is the only Party that can organize the struggle of the proletariat and all working people against the imperialist war.*

TRANSFORM IMPERIALIST WAR INTO CIVIL WAR

The bourgeoisie is doing everything to compel millions of people to go to war and to die for a cause that is alien to them. *But the proletariat, the working people have nothing to defend in this war.* It is not their war, but the war of their exploiters. It brings them suffering, privation, ruin and death. Were they to support such a war, they would merely defend the interests of their enslavers and oppressors, would be supporting capitalist slavery. *For the working class there is only one true stand, namely, irreconcilable, courageous struggle against the imperialist war, struggle against the culprits and vehicles of this war primarily in their own country, struggle to end this predatory war... This is the justest of causes, one dictated by the fundamental interests of the proletariat and all working people.*

WAR ACCELERATES CLASS-POLARISATION

The war that has unfolded between the imperialist countries has radically changed the international situation. *The war is leading to an acute sharpening of all the basic contradictions of the capitalist world. The longer it goes on, the*

more does it sharpen the contradiction between the imperialist states. It is sharpening the contradictions between the metropolitan countries and the colonies, between the dominating and the oppressed nations, and the most important thing is that it is laying bare the class relations in bourgeois society and sharpening to the uttermost limits the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the whole world of the exploited and the handful of exploiters. The war is disclosing all the bankruptcy of the capitalist system and is giving rise to a most acute and profound crisis of capitalism. *The imperialist war is calling forth a regrouping of the class forces in the capitalist countries.* In the camp of the bourgeoisie, the group interests of its different sections are receding before the common class interests of the bourgeoisie. The previously existing division into various opposing groups, into more reactionary and less reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie, is yielding place to their common interest in conducting the war and preserving capitalism. "National Unity" is being established from the extreme reactionary to the extreme "Left" wing of the bourgeoisie, including the top leaders of the petty-bourgeois parties. But at the same time, the other pole is witnessing the beginning of the accelerated departure of the war-ruined masses from the position of support for bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties to the position of struggle against the imperialist war and against the bourgeoisie waging it. Decisive significance in the administration of the state, both in the warring and in the majority of the other capitalist countries, is being assumed by the most bellicose chauvinistic, most reactionary elements of the financial bourgeoisie. A regime of military dictatorship is in fact being established, although frequently masked by various outward decorations, for the suppression of the indignation of the masses against the war and for the safeguarding of the bourgeois system against possible convulsions. Everywhere in the capitalist world, not only in the warring countries, a furious reactionary drive is taking place against the working class and the toiling masses. *Thus, that which in the period preceding the present war was characteristic of the regime of the fascist countries, is becoming—in the conditions of the war let loose—increasingly prevalent in the countries of so-called bourgeois democracy.*

NEW SITUATION—NEW TASKS—NEW TACTICS

In these changed conditions, the tasks facing the working class also assume a new character. Whereas formerly the task was to concentrate all forces on the struggle to avert the imperialist war, to curb the warmongers, now the mobilisation of the widest masses for the struggle against the war already being waged, and to bring it to an end, is the prime task of the moment. Whereas formerly it was a question of barring the road to the onslaught of capital and fascist reaction, now the working class is faced with the task of conducting a most resolute struggle against the regime being established of unbridled terror, oppression and plunder of the popular masses; it is faced with the task of insuring that the ruling classes are prevented from placing the burdens of the war on the backs of the working people. Whereas formerly the efforts of the working class were directed primarily to the defence of the daily interests of the working people and to guarding them against the plunder and licence of the capitalist exploiters, and it was impossible, by virtue of the absence of the necessary pre-conditions, to place the abolition of capitalist slavery on the order of the day, now, to the extent that the crisis called forth by the war grows deeper, this task will face the working class with ever-growing acuteness. *The changed situation and the new tasks of the working class also demand a corresponding change in the tactics of the Communist Parties.* The United proletarian and peoples' front tactics pursued in recent years made it possible for the proletariat and the labouring masses temporarily to hold up the offensive of capital and imperialist reaction in a number of countries. It helped the Spanish people to conduct an armed struggle for two and a half years against internal reaction and the foreign interventionists. It made it possible for the proletariat of France to secure considerable social gains. The peoples' front movement awakened wide masses of people in town and country to activity, and rallied them to the struggle to uphold their own interests against the reactionary cliques. This movement rendered it possible to postpone for a time the outbreak of the European war. The tactics of the United Peoples' Front are fully applicable even now in China and also in colonial and dependent countries, the peoples of which are conducting a struggle for their National Liberation.

COLLAPSE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY & OF "PETTY-BOURGEOIS" DEMOCRACY

But these tactics, in the form in which they were conducted prior to the present war, are no longer suitable for other countries. *The necessity of changing the tactics is conditioned by the changes in the situation and the tasks facing the working class, and also by the position occupied in connection with the imperialist war by the leading circles of the parties that previously took part in the Popular Front.* The tactics of the united peoples' front presupposed joint action by the Communist Parties and the Social-Democratic and petty-bourgeois "democratic" and "radical" parties against reaction and war. *But the top sections of these parties have now openly passed over to the position of active support for the imperialist war.* The Social-Democratic, "democratic" and "radical" flunkies of the bourgeoisie are brazenly distorting the anti-fascist slogans of the popular front, and are using to deceive the masses of the people and to cover up the imperialist character of the war. Under the flag of "National Unity," they have in fact established a common front with the capitalist, a front stretching from the conservatives to labour leaders—in England, and from Cagoulards to the Socialists—in France. The top leaders of the Social-Democratic parties and the reformist Trade Unions shamelessly took up front rank posts in the camp of the imperialists from the very first day of the war. As long as the ruling classes of Britain and France had hopes of directing Germany's expansion against the Soviet Union and of utilising the reactionary regime of the German bourgeoisie against the revolutionary working class movement, the Social-Democratic leaders stood for the policy of concessions to the desires of Germany. They preached "integral pacifism," fulminated against those who exposed the men of Munich, preached "peace at any price," and proposed the peaceful regulation of questions concerning the distribution of sources of raw materials, spheres of influence and colonies. But when it became clear that German expansion was taking place not in the direction of the Soviet Union, but against the spheres of domination and the colonies of Britain and France, and that, on the other hand, the Soviet Union had no intention of pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for them, the "socialist" pacifists became transformed into the most furious instigators of war. They directed the poisonous sting of their slander against

the Land of Socialism, against the revolutionary workers and the Communist Parties. *The leading circles of the Second International are fulfilling the most filthy and criminal role in the blood-dripping slaughter-machine of the war.* They are deceiving the masses by their homilies regarding the anti-fascist character of the war and are helping the bourgeoisie to drive the peoples to the slaughter-house. The ruling classes well know that the masses of the people will not believe the British lords, French bankers and their press when they try to convince them of the anti-fascist character of the war, and allege that it is being waged in defence of Poland and in the interests of their own people. In the war of 1914-1918 already the bourgeoisie was aware that without the assistance of social democracy, it would be unable to set alight the flames of chauvinism, to deceive the masses with the slogan of "the defence of the fatherland" and to drive them to the field of death for the sake of its imperialist interests. Now it is again placing great hopes on social democracy.

THE TWO INTERNATIONALS: THE TWO PATHS

The behaviour of the leading circles of the Second International and their social-chauvinistic position in the war also throws a vivid light on the whole of their previous policy, the policy of stubbornly sabotaging unity in the ranks of the working class and its struggle directed towards averting the imperialist war. The Communist International did everything to unite, to rally together the forces of the working class for this end. It addressed to the Second International and the International Federation of Trade Unions a proposal for united action by the international proletariat against the Italian onslaught on Abyssinia. It proposed joint action by all working class organisations to repulse Japanese imperialism when it attacked the Chinese people. On numerous occasions, as everybody knows, it addressed a similar proposal for joint action in defence of the Spanish people. The Communists persistently pointed out at that time that the policy of "non-intervention" was leading to the kindling of a new imperialist war. At the time of "Munich" the Communists strove to secure the establishment of a real front of the peoples, with the participation of the U.S.S.R. against the provokers of war. But the social-democratic leaders systematically disrupted all these efforts of the Communists. It now becomes clear to all who do not wish

to close their eyes to incontrovertible facts that it is precisely the social democratic leaders all these Blums and Paul Faures, Citrines, Attlees, Greenwoods, and De Brouckeres—who bear the direct responsibility for the fact that they, by disrupting the united actions of the international proletariat capable of preventing war, rendered it possible for the bourgeoisie to doom millions of people to destruction for the sake of its mercenary interests.

SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY SHARES WAR-RESPONSIBILITY

It is Blum and his confederates together with the British and French bourgeoisie who strangled Republican Spain by the policy of "non-intervention," supported the Munich "peace-makers" for the purpose of war against the Soviet Union and who now are demanding that the working people should go to their death for the restoration of the bankrupt reactionary state of the Polish landlords and capitalists. It is he and his confederates who disrupted the united working class and peoples' front in France and opened up the flood-gates to the most furious bourgeois reaction against the working class. It is they, together with Jouhaux, who are now stabbing the French proletariat in the back, by splitting its united trade unions and placing them at the service of the war. It is Blum and his confederates who are now dragging the workers and peasants to shed their blood and die for the maintenance of the colonial domination of the British and French imperialists over the peoples of India, Morocco, Indo-China. It is the Blums, the De Brouckeres, the British Labour leaders, together with the bourgeoisie of France and Britain who are taking up the discredited banner of "Anti-Comintern" which the German National Socialists were compelled by the force of circumstances to give up. It is social democratic ministers of a number of countries who refused to sell arms to the Spanish people for its heroic struggle, and who now, behind the mask of neutrality, are assisting the war contractors in every way in their trade in the weapons of death and are inflaming the Anti-Communist and Anti-Soviet campaign.

FORGE FIGHTING UNITY OF THE PEOPLE IN A NEW WAY FROM BELOW

It clearly follows from the above that *the Communists can have no united front whatsoever with those who are in a common front with the Imperialists, and support the criminal anti-popular war.* The working class and all working people have nothing in common with the social-democratic, "democratic" and "radical" politicians who are betraying the vital interests of the popular masses. *Between the masses of the people and these lackeys of imperialism lies the abyss of sanguinary war.* But in the conditions of the war and of the crisis which it has called into being the need for working class unity and for rallying the wide masses of the working people around the working class rises more acutely than formerly. Millions of working people in the capitalist world, and above all in the warring countries, are vitally interested in bringing about militant working class unity and establishing a real popular front against the war let loose by the capitalists, against raging reaction and the unbridled plunder of the masses. And the Communists will not only not cease the struggle for unity of the proletarian ranks and for rallying together the masses of the working people, but will also increase their efforts tenfold in this direction. However, the question now of bringing about working class unity and of creating a united popular front is raised in a new fashion. In the period preceding the war, the Communists strove to bring about united working class action by agreement between the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties. Now such an agreement is no longer thinkable. *In the present situation, working class unity can and must be achieved from below, on the basis of the development of the movement of the working masses themselves and in a resolute struggle against the treacherous leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties.* And this process will be facilitated to a great degree by the comradely relations that have been established in recent years between the Communists and a considerable section of the social-democratic workers in the joint struggle against reaction and the war-makers. It will also be facilitated by the fact that the social democratic parties, under the weight of the criminal policy of their leaderships, will increasingly disintegrate, and the healthy proletarian section of these parties will join with

the Communists in taking the path of struggle against the Imperialist War and Capitalism.

WAGE RESOLUTE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE 'LABOUR' FLUNKYS OF IMPERIALISM!

In the preceding period the Communists strove to secure the establishment of a united popular front by agreements with the Social-Democratic and other petty-bourgeois "democratic" and "radical" parties in the person of their leading bodies, on the basis of a common platform of struggle against fascism and war. But to the extent that the top leaders of these parties have crossed over wholly and completely into the camp of the imperialists, while certain of them such as the French radicals are directly in charge of the conduct of the war, there can be no question of such agreement. Now the mustering of the working class, of the basic masses of the peasantry, of the urban working folk and of the progressive intelligentsia can and must be brought about *apart from and against the leadership of these parties, on the basis of the struggle against the imperialist war and reaction in a united front from below. Such a fighting united front of the masses cannot be brought about without a most resolute struggle against the Social-Democratic, "Democratic" and "Radical" flunkys of imperialism, for the elimination of the influence of these agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement and for their isolation from the masses of the working people.*

NEW EPOCH : NEW PERSPECTIVES

History now faces the working class of the capitalist countries with tasks of enormous importance. They have to extricate millions of people from the abyss of war, to save their countries and peoples from ruin, devastation and destruction. Only the working class, taking the lead of the basic masses of the peasantry and the working people of the towns, is in a position resolutely to resist the bourgeoisie and imperialism, to put an end to their sanguinary criminal work and to do away once and for all with the causes giving rise to imperialist wars. These tasks, which face the working class, are quite capable of fulfilment. Now the forces of the international proletariat have grown immeasurably by comparison with the first imperialist

war. Its vanguard detachment—the working class of the U.S.S.R.—has established an impregnable fortress of Socialism. The existence of the Soviet Union multiplies the might of the working class of all the capitalist countries and fortifies their confidence in their own strength. As distinct from the first imperialist war, the trust of the working masses in the bourgeoisie, in capitalism, has already at the beginning of the present war been considerably undermined and will continue increasingly to be undermined. The social-democratic leaders will not succeed for long in deceiving the masses, as they were able to do during the first imperialist war. Their treacherous policy, their anti-Communist anti-Soviet drive is already causing acute discontent in the ranks of the social-democratic parties themselves. As the war goes on, the indignation of the masses will grow and the anti-war movement will become increasingly extensive. The most furious persecution by the bourgeoisie is not in a position to hold up and stifle the struggle of the working people against the imperialist war.

THE NEW TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

The historic role of the Communist vanguard of the working class is at the present moment to organise and take the lead of this struggle. If the Communists are to be able successfully to fulfil this role of theirs, they must show an example of the correct understanding of the essence of the present war and utterly smash the legend regarding its alleged anti-fascist, just character, so assiduously spread about by the social democratic leaders. *Explain, explain and once again explain the real state of affairs to the masses*—this above all at the present moment is the most important condition for the mobilisation of the masses for the struggle against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction. The unfolding of a really wide movement against the imperialist war and reaction can only be successful if the Communists act and conduct the struggle in the very midst of the masses, keep a sharp watch as to their state of mind, take careful heed of their voice, and take their needs and sufferings to heart. The Communists must not run ahead. They must put forward slogans that correspond to the concrete situation, slogans that can be understood and grasped by the masses, must always take the lead of the movement of the masses and lead them on to the solution of the maturing new tasks. *The present exceptionally serious situation demands of*

the Communists that they do not give way at all to repression and persecution, but come forward resolutely and courageously against the War, against the bourgeoisie of their own country, that they act in the way Lenin taught, in the way taught now by the great, wise leader of the working people, Comrade Stalin. The Communist Parties must rapidly reorganise their ranks in accordance with the conditions of the war, purge their ranks of rotten, capitulatory elements, and establish iron Bolshevik discipline. They must concentrate their fire against opportunism, expressed in slipping into the position of "defending the fatherland," in support of the fairy tale about the anti-fascist character of the war, and in retreat before the acts of the bourgeoisie. All the sooner the Communist Parties achieve all this, the better will they be able to carry through their independent leading role in the working class movement and the more successfully can they fulfil the tasks now facing them.

FOLLOW THE HEROIC EXAMPLE OF THE RUSSIAN BOLSHEVIKS

As the war goes on, all the Communist Parties, all working class organisations, all active workers are put to the supreme test. Individual weak elements, faint hearts, will drop away at sharp turns. Elements alien to the working class, careerists, renegades, who have tacked themselves on to the Communist Party will be thrown overboard. The Communist Parties will, as a whole, undoubtedly stand the test. They will become still better steeled in the coming battles. New hundreds of thousands of fighters for the working class cause will fill the ranks of the Army of Communism. *The Communist Parties and the working class of the capitalist countries will be inspired by the heroic example of the Russian Bolsheviks, by the example of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which in 1914-18 showed the proletariat the true way out of the War and subsequently secured the victory of socialism over one-sixth of the globe. By holding aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism, and strengthening the bonds of fraternal solidarity between the working class of all countries the Communists will thereby help all working people to fulfil their historic mission. The imperialists of the warring countries have begun the War for a new partition of the earth, for world domination, dooming millions of people to destruction. The*

working class is called upon to put an end to the War after its own fashion, in its own interests, in the interests of the whole of labouring mankind and thereby to destroy once and for all the fundamental causes giving rise to imperialist wars.

(1939)

P. C. JOSHI

IMPERIALIST WAR INTO PEOPLE'S WAR (1942)

LENIN distinguished between two kinds of wars predatory, and consequently, unjust wars, and wars of liberation, just wars.

The Germans are now waging a predatory war, an unjust war for the purpose of seizing foreign territory and subjugating foreign peoples. That is why all honest people must rise against the German robbers, as enemies.

Unlike Hitlerite Germany, the Soviet Union and its allies are waging a war of liberation, a just war, for the purpose of liberating the enslaved peoples of Europe and the U.S.S.R., from Hitler's tyranny.

We have not, and cannot have, any such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories and the subjugation of foreign people—whether it be peoples and territories of Europe or Asia, including Iran.

We have not, and cannot have, any such war aims as that of imposing our will and our regime upon the Slavonic or other enslaved nations of Europe, who are expecting our help. Our aim is to help these nations in the struggle of liberation they are waging against Hitler's tyranny and then to leave it to them quite freely to organise their life on their lands as they think fit. There must be no interference whatever in the internal affairs of other nations!

—J. STALIN, *November 6, 1941.*

This war with fascist Germany cannot be considered an ordinary war. It is not only a war between two armies, it is also a great war of the entire Soviet people against the German fascist armies. The aim of the national war in defence of our country against the fascist oppressors is not only to eliminate the danger hanging over our country, but also to add all the European peoples groaning under the yoke of German fascism. In this war of liberation, we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have true allies in the peoples of Europe and America, including the German people

who are enslaved by the Hitlerite misrulers. *Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties. It will be a united front of the peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement and threat of enslavement by Hitler's fascist armies.*

—J. STALIN, July 3, 1941.

I. TRANSFORMATION OF JUNE 22ND

On June 22nd, when Hitler treacherously invaded the U.S.S.R., it was no more an extension of the Second Imperialist War but its transformation into a People's War. The war against the U.S.S.R. changed the character of the whole Second World War.

NOT EXTENSION BUT TRANSFORMATION

The attack on Red Russia was not like an attack on any other country. It was an attack on the Socialist Fatherland of the workers of all lands, it was an attack on the anti-imperialist friend of the oppressed peoples of the East; it was an attack on a new civilisation, it was an attack on one-sixth of the earth, which alone was really free and prosperous, which embodied the best dreams and all the hopes of the best of mankind, and behind which stood not only the organised worldwide Communist movement but all freedom-loving and progressive peoples. It was an attack on the one people's government, on the one free union of nations the like of which the world has not yet known, which represents the interests of its own peoples and of all the peoples of the world. It was an attack on the Red Flag planted on the only victorious fortress of World Revolution, that the workers, toilers, and enslaved nations of all lands possess.

That dastardly attack did not and could not succeed. The attack on the U.S.S.R. was a stepping stone to world domination in the foul dreams of the fascist brigands. The defence of the U.S.S.R. became the beginning of the battle for world liberation, in actual reality. The unconquerable defender of the fortress of World Revolution came into action as the foremost fighter for world liberation. Such is the world historic role of the U.S.S.R.

The attack on the U.S.S.R. transforms the character of the imperialist war into a people's war. The attack on the U.S.S.R. is a call for people's mobilisation to win the war. The victory of the U.S.S.R. becomes the guarantee of people's liberation all over.

This is the new and decisive change in the whole world situation, end of the period of the imperialist war, beginning of the period of the People's War. It is a historic turning point for all humanity, for the peoples of all lands.

AIM OF WORLD DOMINATION DISRUPTED

With the entry of the Soviet Union, the war in which two imperialist blocs were fighting for world domination is transformed. It now becomes a war waged by the united front of the peoples led by the Socialist Soviet Union for the destruction of Hitler fascism and its allies and for world liberation.

Hitler, when he struck against the Soviet Union, hoped by that act to create an all European—nay, an all-world front against Bolshevism. He hoped that his rivals, especially the British imperialists, menaced by his European victories and favourably impressed by his attack against the base of world revolution, would now agree to settle up with him the issue of the division of the world at the expense of the Soviet Union. But his calculations went wrong. He counted without the might of the Soviet Union, which was based on 24 years of Socialist construction and on the invincible unity of the Soviet peoples. He counted without the bond of brotherhood which existed between the peoples of the world and the Soviet Union to whom they looked for lead and for liberation in the struggles against imperialism. He counted without the fact that two years of imperialist war had only sharpened the conflict between the Axis Powers and the Anglo-American bloc. The result is that Hitler and his allies now face their inevitable doom at the hands of the most powerful combination of the peoples of the world led by the U.S.S.R.

The British and American imperialists who had staked so much on the policies of turning the fascist powers against the Soviet Union and had suffered a series of disasters and defeats as a consequence during the two years of the imperialist war, had now no other alternative but to join with the Soviet Union and bring into existence that very alignment which they had all these years prevented and tried to sabotage. The one bloc of

world imperialism, the fascists, now face the firing squad of the peoples of the world. The other bloc, headed by the *British and American imperialists are caught in the pincer grip of that mighty coalition through which they can no more attain their dream of world domination to which however they still hold.*

WORLD LIBERATION ON THE AGENDA

On June 22nd, the crisis of world imperialism which began with the outbreak of the Second World War, enters a new stage. The imperialists are divided sharply on a world scale in relation to the Soviet Union. In every country there is a parallel division. The peoples of the world on the other hand, get united in one common front nationally and internationally, under one leader, the Soviet Union, for one aim: the destruction of fascism and the achievement of people's peace, in one indivisible war: the war of world liberation. On June 22nd, the peoples of the world cease being pawns and victims of the imperialist bourgeoisie in their game of world domination. They now step forth as the main actors, under their own leader—the Soviet Union—shaping their own destiny, achieving their own liberation by advancing to win the people's war in a people's way. *On June 22, Hitler Fascism rang its own deathknell. It was also the deathknell of world imperialism as we have known it so far. The first salvoes fired by the Red Army against the advancing Nazi hordes ushered in the new epoch: the epoch of the struggle for the people's world. This is the meaning of the transformation of 22nd June.*

II. ANTI-FASCIST WAR OF WORLD LIBERATION GENERAL CRISIS—BASIC CONFLICT

After the First World War, world imperialism entered the period of its last and permanent crisis. The most striking feature of this crisis was that one-sixth of the world passed irrevocably out of its grasp. The victorious November Revolution in Russia, the birth of the U.S.S.R. was one permanent victory for the peoples of the world. Here the peoples of the Soviet Union began building a new world, a new life of Socialism, and a new fighting army and a base for the emancipation of the peoples of the capitalist world. *The world of socialism*

grew stronger and more powerful every year, became more and more an object lesson and a rallying centre to the peoples of the rest of the world. The world of capitalism, on the other hand, decayed, passing from one economic crisis to another. All its conflicts became more and more insoluble. The imperialists crushed the early post-war revolutions and entered into a period of partial stabilisation, only to find that it was the beginning of one of the deepest and longest economic crises they had ever known. A revolutionary situation grew up in several capitalist countries again. In the colonies, especially in India and China, a powerful revolutionary upsurge for independence broke out. The conflict between the two groups of imperialists, between the main victors of the last war and the rest led by Germany developed, for redivision of the world, for colonies and markets.

NEW IMPERIALIST CONFLICT

The second Imperialist War really began in 1931 when Japan attacked Manchuria and spread with Italy's attack on Abyssinia and with re-armed Germany's aggressions in Europe. These three powers stepped forth on the arena of world politics with a demagogic claim for "living space" for their peoples and as holy crusaders against the menace of Communism and the revolution. What they really wanted was colonies, markets and spheres of influence which they could only get by wresting them from the grip of the master imperialist powers, viz., Britain and America.

The British and American imperialists were not blind to this danger but they deliberately allowed these powers to grow as spearheads of counter-revolution in Europe and in the East (China) and against the Soviet Union. As the bosses of the world, they were playing "the big and dangerous game" of nourishing reaction and hurling it against the rising revolution and against the U.S.S.R. This is how they thought they would be able to solve the new conflicts at the expense of the peoples and of the Soviet Union and thus save their bossdom of the world.

This policy meant the strengthening of fascism, the spread of the second imperialist war as an open world war and a war against the Soviet Union as well. To defeat this monstrous policy of world imperialism, led by the fascist and pro-fascist reactionaries, the advanced sections of the peoples led by their

Communist Parties and in alliance with the Soviet Union, sought to create a worldwide anti-fascist peace front.

TWO CAMPS "

Already in the years of growing fascism and fascist aggression which preceded the outbreak of the present war, the world was divided into two camps.

The camp of world imperialism stood for reaction. It was led by the fascist and the pro-fascist reactionaries, who were driving the world towards fascism and war, perpetuation of colonial enslavement and attack on the Soviet Union.

The camp of the peoples of the world was the camp of progress. It was led by the Soviet Union and the advanced sections of the peoples of the world. It was taking shape as a world anti-fascist front of peace which stood for fighting back fascism and fascist aggression, for preventing war in alliance with the Soviet Union. It stood for maintaining peace through collective security, for freedom and democracy for every country, including the colonies.

This peace front was, however, disrupted before it could consolidate itself. It was betrayed by those who believed that Chamberlain and Daladier "non-intervened" in Spain in order to save peace, who believed that Czechoslovakia was being broken up and handed over to Hitler to save peace, who believed that Japan was being "appeased" to save peace.

The result was that the British, the French and the American imperialists went on with their game of strengthening their fascist rivals in the hope that they would attack the Soviet Union. These plans, however, ended in a fiasco for their makers. Hitler did not feel himself strong enough yet to attack the U.S.S.R. He preferred to sign a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union which infuriated the British reactionaries so much that they promptly declared war against Germany.

THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

With the outbreak of the second World War in September 1939, the front of the people, the front of peace was cut up. People were ranged against people.

The British and the French imperialists told their people that they were fighting against Hitlerism and for freedom and democracy and for Poland. In reality, they were doing nothing of the sort. In Hitler they were fighting the rival imperialist who had "betrayed" them, i.e., who had refused to attack the

U.S.S.R. and play the part of junior partner in *their* scheme of world domination.

Hitler had preferred to make a bid for world domination on his own and against the British and French hegemony. He cheated the German peoples by saying that he was fighting for "living space" for Germany against Britain and France who owned almost the whole world.

It was a war for world domination, for colonies, raw materials and markets, on both sides. The people had nothing to defend in that war. They were dragged into it as pawns and victims by their imperialist rulers. The advanced sections of the people in every belligerent country fought to end it.

The Soviet Union stood aside. Germany dared not attack it as yet and had signed a Non-Aggression Pact with it. The British imperialists had failed in their game of war provocation for the time being. That the Soviet Union stood aside and neutral was a great fiasco for the British and French imperialists. They got the war in a manner they had not bargained for. They had staked too much on a war in the East to serve their own ends. Even after the outbreak of the war, the British imperialists tried hard to light the conflagration in the East. They provoked Finland to fight the U.S.S.R. and openly supported it. They staked on themselves getting involved in a war with the U.S.S.R. with a view to encourage Germany to attack the U.S.S.R. These plans came to nought.

SOVIET LEADS PEACE FORCES

The Soviet Union pursuing an independent policy of peace had strength enough to smash these machinations. She was determined to maintain peace in the East in her own interests and in the interests of all the peoples of the world. She sought to help and actually helped her neighbouring states to get out of the clutches of the imperialist warmongers and stand with her in consolidating a peace bloc in the East, in preventing the spread of the war. She explained to the peoples of the warring states that the war which their ruling class was waging was an imperialist war. She appealed for peace before the conflagration had spread farther. *Though the front of the peoples and of peace had been broken by the outbreak of the Imperialist War, the Soviet Union remained and grew strong as a mighty people's base, vigilant and ever ready to re-unite with the peoples of the other countries as soon as the situation was*

ready for it. The Communist Parties in every country were struggling to re-establish the common front against Imperialism as a world united front of the peoples for ending the Imperialist War and for Peoples' Peace.

THE NEMESIS

The dramatic and disastrous developments of the first 22 months of the Second World War sharpened the crisis of the bourgeois system to such an extent that it became a crisis of the bourgeois ruling class itself. As the war progressed, the conflict between Germany and Britain sharpened. It became a worldwide conflict in which all the big imperialist states virtually lined up either on one side or another. The British imperialists who had staked so much on a war in the East (against the Soviet) had weakened the states of Western Europe in their efforts to appease fascism. They had allowed the ruling class of these countries to be corroded by fascism. They had assisted in the battering down of popular movements in these countries. The nemesis of this reactionary policy became visible when Hitler struck against Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and France. Weakened by Fascism from within, these countries collapsed. Their peoples fell under the enslaving whip of Hitler's armies. Hitler gained command over the whole of Western Europe and its industrial resources. He seized the strategic coastline of Western Europe from Narvik to Bordeaux. He was now able to hold the threat of invasion and rain destruction and death on the heads of the British people.

IMPERIALIST CONFLICT SHARPENS

Having thus liquidated the Western Front, Hitler turned eastwards—towards the Balkans. Here too the ruling class divided itself into pro-German and pro-British groups. The people in general desired peace in alliance with the U.S.S.R. Hitler, of course, wanted to conquer the Balkans. The British imperialists wanted to create a new front against Hitler there. Hitler strengthened the pro-fascist groups. They encouraged the pro-British sections to suppress the pro-Soviet peace trend of the people and go to war. It is Hitler who profited by this disruption and by the weakening of the popular movement. He succeeded in enslaving Rumania and in immobilising Bul-

garia. He conquered Yugoslavia and Greece by the force of arms and instituted a regime of Hitler-terror in these countries. Hitler's mastery of the Balkans created a serious menace to British interests in the Middle East and to the Suez. Hitler's mastery of Europe created the most serious challenge to Britain's as well as America's supremacy of the world that history has ever known before. The British and American imperialists drew closer together to conduct what was virtually a joint war against German imperialism (Anglo-American Naval agreement). Hitler faced them with the Tripartite Pact of military alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan. In the Spring of 1941, the war was on the eve of becoming a giant world conflict, fought over all continents and oceans between two giant imperialist blocs. The Anglo-American imperialist bloc having lost the initiative and points of vantage to the enemy in the first round, was preparing to regain its world supremacy by a long war of attrition and began mobilising all resources.

WHY HITLER STRUCK

Hitler knew the difficulties of facing such a protracted war against such a mighty combination. He had conquered Europe but he was sitting on top of a live volcano, of a dozen subjugated nations. He had seized vast industrial plants but needed raw material resources badly. Above all it was necessary to split the mighty combination forming against him. He sought the solution of all these in the dastardly and treacherous attack upon the Soviet Union. He hoped to seize vast resources of wheat, coal and oil. He hoped to smash the base of revolution and thus perpetuate his conquest and enslavement of Europe. He hoped, above all, to bring about a split in the ruling circles of Britain on the issue of discontinuing the war against Hitler now that he has turned against the Soviet and reaching a settlement with him. He hoped this would also bring about a split between England and America.

A NEW ALIGNMENT

Hitler staked his all on the attack against the Soviet Union. He "gambed against the class revolution" as Comrade Stalin puts it. He hoped to make a decisive turn in his own favour, in the war of world domination. What happened was indeed a decisive turn—the greatest that human history has ever known

but it was exactly the opposite of what Hitler expected. He hoped to divide his imperialist rivals. But what actually happened was that the attack against the Soviet Union called into existence a mighty united front of the peoples, led by the Soviet Union. A division in the ruling circles of British and American imperialism did indeed come about but not as Hitler wanted it. The section which now became dominant in Britain was not the pro-fascist section which had pursued the anti-Soviet policy, but the one which threw that policy overboard and allied itself with the Soviet Union. A parallel change took place in America. The result was that a powerful coalition of Britain, America and the U.S.S.R. now faced Hitler. The driving power behind this was, of course, the alliance of the peoples of Europe and America, led by the U.S.S.R. Hitler miscalculated how deep the conflict between the rival imperialist blocs had become as a result of his conquests and what bitter lessons the peoples of Europe and America themselves had learned out of the disasters of the last two years.

BANKRUPTCY OF BOURGEOIS POLICIES

The attack upon the U.S.S.R. revealed as if in a single flash, how deep and insoluble the crisis of world-imperialism had become and how bankrupt their policies were. Hitler-fascism by that act becomes at once the main enemy of all mankind, the greatest menace to the freedom and democracy of the peoples of the whole world. * The imperialist rulers of Britain and America have had to throw overboard their 23 year-old hostility towards the Soviet Union and to join hands with her. *They certainly hope to save their world domination through this alignment but the reality is exactly the opposite.* The powerful unity of the peoples of the world with the Soviet Union which stands behind this alignment grows ever stronger through the war itself and through the heroic example and inspiration of the Soviet Union. It becomes more determined than ever to see that not world domination is attained through this war, but the utter destruction of Hitler-fascism and its allies, and the achievement of world liberation.

HITLER'S DOOM

The stroke with which Hitler hoped to reach his world supremacy as if in one leap, becomes the disastrous turning point in his fortunes, the beginning of the end of his criminal designs against humanity. The vaunted invincibility of his blitzkrieg which had become a terror was debunked by the unconquerable might of the Red Army and the Soviet people. Only an emancipated people with 24 years of Socialism behind them could build such a powerful military machine, and such a rocklike and indomitable unity of peoples which shattered all Hitler's boastful plans. Instead of wintering in Moscow, Leningrad and Rostov, his armies are now rolling back battered, bruised and frost-bitten. In his rear flames forth the wrath of the subjugated peoples of Europe in the form of a gathering people's revolt. In Germany itself, in the Army Command, in the ranks, among the people in the fields and factories in the rear the discontent grows greater and greater for the gathering storm.

WAR IN THE PACIFIC

In his desperation, Hitler played his last card when he instigated Japan to launch her prepared aggression in the Pacific. That is a blow aimed at the most vulnerable spot of British and American supremacy—their colonial empire. The Jap fascists are certainly scoring initial victories against and at the cost of the peoples of the Philippines, Malaya and Burma whom the imperialist colonial rule left defenceless, unarmed and enslaved. The Jap fascists are utilising the natural national emancipatory and anti-imperialist sentiments to split the colonial people from the joint front of the peoples of the world against fascism and for freedom that is growing up under Soviet leadership. But the peoples of India and of the colonies in the East who have learned by their experience that freedom cannot come as a gift from British imperialism also know well that it can neither come to them on the point of the blood-stained sword of the Japanese fascists. The colonial peoples are determined to line up in the world front of the peoples under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the Chinese people to win the war against Hitler and the Jap fascists and to win their own freedom and defend their homelands despite the imperialists. Thus the new extension of the war to the

Pacific and the East brings no relief to the fascist world enslavers. It only accentuates their death-crisis into which they plunged on June the 22nd.

QUANDARY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

British and American imperialists are facing a crisis of distintegration of their Empire and their ruling class, the successive fiascoes of their policies for maintaining their world domination have landed them finally into an alignment which can no longer become a tool in their hands for attaining their selfish class aim—world domination. The very alliance with the U.S.S.R. brings about on the one hand, a division in the ruling class of Britain and America and on the other, a powerful unity of the peoples nationally and internationally. As the war progresses this unity grows in power and demands more and more firmly closest co-operation with the Soviet and Chinese peoples politically, militarily and economically to achieve the joint peoples' war aims. These war aims which become the banner of the all peoples' war against fascism are :

- (a) Complete annihilation of Hitler-fascism and its allies in Italy and Japan ;
- (b) People's victory, ensuring liberation of *all* the peoples in Europe, Asia and America ;
- (c) People's peace—a peace without annexations, based on the independence and democratic liberties of all the nations and peoples of the world and consolidated by their free and equal co-operation.

The imperialist governments still attempt to pursue their old aims through the new alignment which brings them up against a united people getting more and more impatient of vacillations and who are determined to win the people's war in a people's way. These Governments who have divided bourgeois ruling class behind them and a united people before them, are less and less capable of enforcing their aims and policies on the people. It is the people who are now in a position to seize the Government by the scruff and make it do their own bidding more and more, isolating the reactionary section from it.

TOWARDS A PEOPLE'S WORLD

Hitler-fascism and its allies are a scourge which was born out of the festering general crisis of world imperialism which began with the end of the last war. It is the British and American imperialists who forged this poisoned spearhead of counter-revolution to stab the people's revolutionary movements in Spain, China and France, and to attack the Socialist Soviet Union. That is how they hoped to save world imperialism and their domination in the world. History has wreaked a horrible vengeance on the peoples of Europe and of the world for their failure to resist and frustrate these reactionary policies of their rulers in time. Hitler enslaved the whole of Europe, struck a paralysing blow at his imperialist rivals and felt himself strong enough to fling his murderous hordes against the Soviet Union, the embodied might of the people's revolution. He thought it was his master stroke for world domination. But he had struck his own doom and the doom of world imperialism. The British and American Governments hastened to ally themselves with the Soviet Union. They sought refuge in the camp of the people. They yet dream of regaining their world domination by the backdoor. Empty dreams! They can do so only by betraying the alliance with the Soviet Union, only by stabbing the people in the back. Can they do it? The peoples of the world have undergone far too much to tolerate such treacheries again. Their consciousness is sharpened by the deeds of unparalleled heroism of the Soviet people. Their unity is forged in a giant world-front under Soviet leadership. The peoples of the capitalist world are determined to smash through all obstacles which hinder them from reaching the goal they have set themselves. They see before them Hitler's murderous armies being rolled back across the blood-stained stretches of the Soviet Union. Their strength is growing in the Nazi-occupied countries of Europe, in Britain and in America. The Jap fascists have struck against the colonial peoples of Philippines, Malaya, the Dutch East Indies and Burma to cut them off from the world unity of the people, to cut off China from India and the rest of the world. They will not succeed in their dastardly designs. Their treacherous aggression will only cement ever more firmly the unity of the peoples of China, India, Burma and East Asia with the peoples of Europe and America in the joint war of world liberation under the leadership of the Soviet Union and its great

leader, Comrade Stalin. *The peoples of the world are advancing arm in arm, with one common aim of destroying Hitler-fascism and its allies, of smashing up the very structure of world imperialism, which bred the plague of fascism, and imperialist war and of replacing it by a world of free peoples.*

"THE WAR IS ON, THE PEOPLE'S WAR, OUR SACRED FINAL FIGHT "

IT WILL NOT STOP TILL THE PEOPLES EMERGE VICTORIOUS

P. C. JOSHI

A NEW REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE

(1942)

"The whole world looks to you as the force capable of destroying the brigand hordes of German invaders. The enslaved peoples of Europe who fell under the yoke of the German invaders, look to you as their liberators. A great liberation mission has fallen to your lot. So be worthy of this mission. The war you wage is a war of liberation—a just war. Let the manly images of our great ancestors inspire you in this war. Let the great victorious banner of Lenin fly over your heads.

Under the Banner of Lenin! Onward to Victory!"

—J. STALIN, Nov. 6, 1941.

"The bourgeoisie need have no doubt that the numerous friends of the working class of the U.S.S.R. in Europe and in Asia will do their best to strike a blow in the rear at their oppressors, who start a criminal war against the working class of all countries. And let not the messieurs the bourgeoisie blame us if some of the governments so near and dear to them, which today rule happily "by grace of god," are missing on the morrow after the outbreak of such a war."

—J. STALIN in 1934.

"To the Soviet Union has fallen the lot of saving these nations, aiding them in their bitter struggle against Hitlerism. A time will come when the Soviet Union and the Soviet people will undoubtedly liberate not only the peoples of Europe but also of the entire world, who well understand and appreciate our intentions."

—M. MOLOTOV at Three Power Conference
at Moscow, 3 Oct., 1941.

1. CRISIS AND SPLIT IN THE BOURGEOIS CAMP

BANKRUPTCY OF CAPITALIST SYSTEM

WHEN the imperialist war turned into people's war, the world entered into a new revolutionary period. Already with the outbreak of the world war in September, 1939, "the bankruptcy of the capitalist system began disclosing itself." "It gave rise to a most acute and profound crisis of capitalism." (Dimitrov). During the 22 months of world-shaking events which followed, this crisis sharpened immensely. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union the crisis of capitalist system deepened into a crisis of the capitalist ruling class itself. British and German imperialists had sought to solve their conflicts at the expense of the Soviet Union. They failed, thanks to the might of the Soviet Union. They had to fight out their own imperialist war, at the expense of the working class and the people in their own countries and colonies. As the war progressed, the conflict between the imperialist rulers and the working class in their countries became more and more acute. Similarly the conflict between them and their colonial or conquered people became sharper. Hitler conquered Europe with comparative ease but that only consolidated the rival Anglo-American bloc, which began doggedly to prepare for a protracted war for defending their title to world supremacy.

CRISIS OF THE BOURGEOISIE

Hitler in order to meet this situation decided to clear his revolutionary rear by striking at the base of future revolutions—the Soviet Union. Besides by hitting against the embodiment of class revolution, he hoped to strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the pro-fascists—the appeasers. That is why he sent Hess, as Mr. Churchill now admits. But instead of a bourgeois unity against Bolshevism, he got world people's unity against fascism. The British and American Governments were forced to enter into an alliance with the Soviet Union, with the very power which they had attempted to destroy for the last 23 years. Behind this coalition is growing up a mighty united front of the peoples led by the Soviet Union which has on its banner writ the slogans: Crush Hitler-Fascism! Win the Liberation of every people in the world! The policies which the bourgeois ruling classes follow yield exactly the

opposite results to what they expect from them. Hitler-fascism and its allies continue their desperate struggle for world domination but they are now faced with the gigantic unity of the peoples of the whole world led by the Soviet Union. The British and American imperialists still dream to save and plan to maintain their colonial empire but they are passing more into the grip of the people's unity, which is carrying on a determined struggle for world liberation. Crisis and division in the camp of the world imperialists and the growing unity of the peoples on a world scale to win the War against Fascism as a war of people's liberation—this is the main feature of the new revolutionary period of the People's War.

NEW REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION

In the period of the imperialist phase of the war, the picture was one of sharpening crisis of the entire capitalist system. The conditions in each country were *maturing towards* a revolutionary situation. The conflict between the ruling class and the ruled became more and more acute and was placing the revolutionary struggle to overthrow the war-mongering governments themselves on the agenda. In the capitalist countries, "to the extent the crisis called forth by the war grew deeper, the task of the abolition of capitalist slavery faced the working class with ever-growing acuteness." (Dimitrov). In the colonial countries like India, the deepening war crisis had placed the mass revolutionary struggle against the imperialist war and for the overthrow of the imperialist government on the agenda. But before either the workers in the capitalist countries or the people in the colonial countries had gathered strength to convert the maturing revolutionary perspective into an actual revolutionary struggle, the Nazi imperialists themselves struck against the Soviet to forestall the revolution. This immediately precipitated a revolutionary situation, which meant crisis and split for the bourgeois ruling class nationally and internationally and a world-wide unity and a revolutionary war for the peoples of the world.

NEW REGROUPING OF CLASS FORCES ON A WORLD PLANE

A new re-grouping of class forces comes into existence on a world scale and in every country. Nazi imperialism and its allies become isolated as the main enemy of all mankind. The mighty coalition of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and America now becomes the instrument in the hands of the united front of the peoples of the world, led by the Soviet Union, to crush this enemy, to achieve the liberation of all the peoples of the world and to deal an annihilating blow to world imperialism as a whole. To unite and mobilise the people in every country, to unite them on a world scale behind the Soviet Union, for achieving these common war aims, for winning the war against fascism and for people's liberation—this becomes the immediate revolutionary task before the workers and peoples in capitalist countries and in the colonial countries ranged against Hitler and Japan, as well as in the Nazi—and Japan—occupied countries. The new re-grouping of class forces on a world plane which corresponds to the people's phase of the war is, therefore this German, Italian and Japanese imperialism versus the United Front of the peoples of the world, including colonial peoples, as well as the peoples of Germany, Austria, Italy and Japan and led by the Soviet peoples. The aim of the camp of Nazi imperialism is world domination—world enslavement. The aim of the camp of the peoples is destruction of fascism and world liberation. The bourgeois government of Britain who are allied with the U.S.S.R. still attempt to pursue policies aimed at retaining and regaining their world supremacy (e.g., colonial enslavement, etc.). To understand how these policies must and can be frustrated, to understand the people's strategy *vis-a-vis* this ally in the anti-fascist front of the governments, we must turn to the re-grouping of class forces in the various countries of the capitalist world.

DIMITROV'S CLASS ANALYSIS

How were the class forces grouped in the period of the imperialist phase of the war? In what direction was this grouping tending? Comrade Dimitrov described this in his famous article: *War and the Working Class* in the following words:

“In the camp of the bourgeoisie, the group interests of its different sections are receding before the common

class interests of the bourgeoisie. The previously existing divisions into various opposing groups, into more reactionary and less reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie, is yielding place to their common interests in conducting the war and preserving capitalism....Decisive significance in the administration of the State, both in the warring and in the majority of the other capitalist countries, is being assumed by the most bellicose, chauvinistic, most reactionary elements of the financial bourgeoisie.... Thus, that which in the period preceding the present war was characteristic of the regime of the fascist countries, is becoming.... in the conditions of the war let loose.... increasingly prevalent in the countries of so-called bourgeois democracy."

REACTIONARY "NATIONAL UNITY" IN IMPERIALIST WAR

This was what was happening in the capitalist countries in the period of imperialist war. In England, for instance, the pro-fascist appeasers' section, headed by Chamberlain, stood together with the less reactionary group of Churchill and Eden and Sinclair, as well as with the capitulatory leadership of the Labour Party. Together, they represented the "national unity" of Reaction which succeeded in dragging the people to support the imperialist war. For this they utilised the anti-fascist sentiments of the people. Not only this, the dominant section in the Government and in administration was and remained the pro-fascist reactionary section in spite of the reshuffling of cabinets. Common profit interest in war and anti-Soviet policy united them. As the imperialist war progressed, the so-called bourgeois-democratic governments began to act more and more like fascist governments. In the case of France and several other neutral European countries, the tendency towards fascisation was disastrously rapid. In the early months of the war, the whole administrative and government apparatus, of the French State was impregnated with fascists. The French ruling class was foremost in anti-Soviet war provocation (e.g., Finland, plan for bombing of Baku in spring, 1940) and in suppressing the Communists. It is they who, shaking before a people's revolutionary defence, opened the front to Hitler and sold the French people into slavery. In several neutral capitalist countries of Eastern Europe, the ruling class, though divided into pro-German sections, stood together in suppressing the people and in pursuing an anti-Soviet policy. Similarly in America, the Isolationist (pro-

Fascists) as well as democrats were more and more finding common ground in the profitable job of aiding Britain's war against Germany and in supporting her anti-Soviet policy.

DIVISION IN THE BOURGEOIS RULING CLASS IN DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES

As Hitler's march proceeded from Denmark and Norway to Crete, conquering the whole of Europe, the self-confident unity of the British ruling class began to crack. The people began to get disillusioned more and more. They began to see the cause in the pro-fascist, anti-Soviet and anti-popular policies of the ruling class. The demand for better relations with the Soviet Union became more and more insistent. Thus when Churchill announced full aid of Britain to the Soviet Union on the 22nd June, he laid the basis of a sharp division in the ruling class of Britain. The anti-Soviet policy of the "appeasers" stood negated. A basis was created for a united national front in England to fight the war against fascism in collaboration with the Soviet Union. A similar division began to take place in the American ruling class, as Roosevelt too lined up with the Soviet. This division has not yet become a split. The Governments remain almost the same as before in form. The more or less progressive sections are at the helm. The reactionaries are in the background but yet in key positions. The progressive sections however, being themselves neither firm nor united on the issue of the most effective prosecution of the war against fascism and the full co-operation with the Soviet Union and the people, continually capitulate to the reactionaries. The result is the Government does not achieve a complete co-operation with the Soviet Union (refusal to open a second front in the west), pursues imperialist policies contrary to aims of people's war (enslavement of India, Burma, etc.) and which hinder its effective prosecution (production lag due to profit-hunting of monopoly capital). All the same a sharp division is taking place in the ruling circles of Britain and America. It is being accentuated by the growing unity and the mobilisation of the people round the one dominating issue of winning the war against fascism. The crisis of the British and American bourgeoisie grows.

II. PEOPLE'S CAMP UNITES

IN THE DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES

As the people's war progresses, the peoples in the democratic countries begin to see in the Soviet Union the indisputable leader of the anti-fascist forces, in every sphere—military, political and economic. They see the glaring contrast between the victorious winter offensive on the Eastern Front and the disastrous fiascoes in the Pacific, which begins to bring home to them the plain truth that the war against fascism can only be won as a people's war of liberation. The people's movement becomes more and more determined and united round the people's war aims. The popular pressure on the Government to chuck out the pro-fascists and reactionaries from its midst and to reconstitute itself so that it can conduct the people's war as an instrument of people's will and in accordance to the people's war aims become more and more effective. Such is the character of the new re-grouping of class forces in the democratic countries (especially in Britain and America).

NEW CLASS ALIGNMENT IN NAZI-OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

This division in the bourgeois ruling class on the one hand and the growth of revolutionary anti-fascist people's unity on the other, is far more strikingly manifest in the Nazi-occupied countries. In the case of these countries, the crisis and the split of the bourgeois ruling class came about in the fateful hour of Hitler's attack. The fascist section betrayed the people and capitulated before Hitler. The pro-British section, which pursued an anti-people and anti-Soviet policy was unable either to save neutrality or to defend the country. This happened in the case of Poland, Norway, France, Yugoslavia and Greece with slight variations. Though defeated and conquered, the advanced section of the people had never laid down their weapons against fascists. But their heroic and isolated deeds did not yet lead to a national upsurge though they paved the way for it. The transformation came about when the Soviet was dragged into the war and when the ex-governments of these countries in London following Mr. Churchill's lead signed treaties of joint action with the Soviet Union. These treaties at once created the basis for the widest national unity in these

countries. The heroic resistance and the indomitable courage of the Soviet people against the fascist invaders, inspired countless patriots in these countries to unite in the common war to overthrow the Nazi-Quisling regimes. A veritable people's war against the fascists began to flare forth in the mountains of Yugoslavia, in Norway, Czechoslovakia and in France. Under the stress of the people's revolutionary upsurge and under the influence of the Soviet Union, the governments of these countries are becoming more truly national and popular. This is shown, for instance, by the new national government for Poland which General Sikorski has formed consisting of all popular parties in that country. It is true most of the ex-governments of the Nazi-occupied countries have not changed in form. But their alliance with the U.S.S.R. and the powerful national unity of the people's upsurge in these countries ensures that these or any other governments representing these countries can no more be tools in the hands of Anglo-American imperialists but will fight for a people's peace and a people's Europe.

UNITED NATIONAL FRONT IN THE COLONIES

In the colonial countries, for instance, in India, the united national front against imperialist rule remained unbroken during the imperialist phase of the war. War sharpened to an extreme measure the conflict between the imperialist government and all the sections of the people. Imperialism wanted the national bourgeois leadership to surrender at its own price and line up with the government and against the people to fight the imperialist war. The Communist Party sought to swing the united national front as a whole towards a mass struggle against imperialist war and for freedom. The Communists were not strong enough organisationally to achieve the task. However, the growing misery of the masses and the imperialist intransigence towards bourgeois compromisers, resulted in the united national front remaining intact though it did not move forward. Our people stood out of war as a body in spite of imperialist repression and disruption. The dominant bourgeois leadership did not surrender to imperialism, but paralysed the whole movement through inactivity and stalemate and kept it in a state of animated suspension. In the imperialist phase of the war, though the crisis and weakening of imperialism has already begun, it is yet on the top of the people. This is mostly due to the compromising and anti-

struggle role of the national bourgeois leadership and due to weakness of the working class.

NEW EQUATION OF CLASS FORCES IN THE SUBJECT COUNTRIES

With the turn of the war into a people's war, the conflict between imperialism and the people sharpened still further and the correlation of forces between the united national front and the imperialist government changes in favour of the former. The task before the united national front now is to unite and mobilise the entire people for the defence of the country, for the defence of the interests of the people and make a bold bid to take the war for liberation in its own hands. The new situation has opened for it the straight and short path forward to national independence. Refusal to take it means fascist enslavement under the Japanese. The imperialists are trying their best to prevent the free and effective popular participation of India in the war by continuing their autocratic regime. But the growing unity of the people in the whole world and Britain which is bent upon winning the war against fascism and for freedom is growing impatient of such a policy. The support for India's demand for freedom is growing among the peoples of Britain. India's freedom is now a part of their own war for freedom and against fascism. In the imperialist ruling circles itself there is a division on the issue of India and the colonies. The fascist attack is upsetting all their neatly laid schemes of perpetuating colonial enslavement. The equation of class forces in the subject countries is now being reversed decisively in favour of their people and their liberation and against imperialism and its continued oppressive rule. The people have to realise the force of their unity. They have to rely upon it and act. The people's struggle to stop the fascist invader is itself to fight for their freedom?

U. N. F. IN CHINA STRENGTHENS

In China too the united national front is further strengthened. It stood solidly as the base of the heroic Chinese people's war against Japanese invaders for the past five years. In the period of imperialist war in the early phase (1939), it was the Japanese and German fascists who tried hard to

split it from within. They found a traitor in Wang Ching wei but they failed to break the unity of the Chinese people or the united front between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China. In 1940 after the fall of France when the danger of war in the Pacific became more and more acute, the British and American imperialists seemed to have brought pressure upon certain elements in the National Government to worsen the relations between the Kuomintang and the Communists. They did not want the Chinese National Government to rely upon the bond with the Communists and with the Soviet people, but on the imperialists alone. In spite of such provocative attempts at split as the victimisation and the disbanding of the Fourth Route Army (manned by the Chinese Communists) the united front did not break, thanks to the political farsightedness and patriotism of the Communists.

CHINA'S ROLE AS LIBERATOR IN THE EAST

Now, with Japan's attack in the Pacific and with the new dangers that face China as a result of the disasters in the South Pacific, the united national front in China is entering into a new stage of consolidation. A great liberating mission has fallen upon the shoulders of the great Chinese national front. The peoples of the Pacific countries, of occupied China, Korea, of Malaya, Indonesia (Dutch East Indies in the imperialist language) and of Philippines look to the heroic Chinese people and to the Soviet people for inspiration and help in their fight against the Japanese fascists. The nationalists as well as Communists of China know very well that they can discharge this responsibility only by relying firmly on their own people, by knitting closer the bond of unity that binds the two great political parties of China and by consolidating the alliance with the U.S.S.R. That is why the Ninth Session of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang adopted the Four-Point Programme (December 1941). An all-out people's mobilisation for war, consolidation of People's Political Council (strengthening unity with other political parties, including the Communist Party), agrarian reform, democratisation of administration—such are the four points of the programme for strengthening the united national front. The national unity of China firmly entrenched in the hearts of her conscious millions, strengthened by alliance with the Soviet Union, would be able to develop the co-operation with the

British and American Governments, and use it effectively for the complete defeat of the Japanese fascists, for the liberation not only of the Chinese people but of all the peoples in East Asia.

III. TWO STRATEGIES

A GIANT CLASS BATTLE

The war waged by the Soviet Union, China, Britain and America against the Fascist powers is not an ordinary war. It is a gigantic class battle, between the peoples of the world and the vanguard of world imperialism and counter-revolution.

The camp of imperialism is today led by the Hitler-fascists. World-conquest, world-enslavement is their aim. Their victory would mean not only the perpetuation of the fascist slavery of the German, Austrian, Italian and Japanese people but the fascist-imperialist enslavement for the peoples of the whole world. In this brutal war, they rely not only on their arms, on the strategic points they have captured but on their stool-pigeons and allies in the camp of the people. They rely upon all that is vile and rotten in each country, upon the reactionary elements in the ruling class of each country, upon the "appeasers" and the reactionary diehards in Britain, upon the "Isolationists" in America, upon the Quislings from the bourgeois class in each country, upon their Fifth Column which is the political machine of the section they pick up as their tool, and upon the selfish and disruptive elements among the colonial people like Wang Ching wei.

The camp of the people is led by the Soviet Union, the vanguard of people's revolution against imperialism, the champion of people's liberation. Soviet Union is a proletarian state—a peoples' state. When it fights for its own liberation from the fascist invaders, it fights for the liberation of all the people. In its inveterate struggle against fascist-imperialism, it relies upon the indomitable unity of its own people, upon the alliance with the peoples and workers in every country, including the countries where fascists rule.

As the war goes on, the camp of the peoples of the world gets more and more united, round one single and single aim: Death to Fascism! Freedom for all! Friends of fascism, reac-

tionary imperialists who hinder the people's fight get isolated, are pinned down and crushed as the unity and the strength of people's mobilisation rises.

In the camp of fascism, the opposite process is taking place. The unity enforced under the whip of fascist enslavement is breaking up vertically and horizontally. Conflict between the Axis partners themselves and within their ruling cliques of each is beginning. The conflict between the Quisling regimes and the people is sharp and is growing sharper daily. The murmur of the enslaved and war-weary peoples of Italy, Japan, Austria and Germany is growing louder and louder.

FASCIST STRATEGY

Two strategies face each other in this world battle: the strategy of the fascist-imperialist and that of the world proletariat. The fascist-imperialists of Germany, Japan and Italy prepared for this war and planned their strategy years ago. They delivered paralysing blows at the strategical points of the rival imperialist bloc. They struck at the base of the people's revolution. They struck at the weak spots of the far-flung colonial empire of their rival. They do not rely upon military strength and strategy alone. They rely mainly on the political factor. They rely upon the reactionary imperialists in the people's camp who would rather come to terms with the fascists than lose the whole world to the people. Their strategy aims at world hegemony for themselves under which they would give a junior partnership to Anglo-American imperialism. It aims at the fascist enslavement of the whole world and the destruction of the Soviet Union.

LAST GASP OF WORLD IMPERIALISM

Fascist strategy is the strategy of world imperialism itself. The crisis of world imperialism has reached such a stage of acuteness that it can save itself; that is, continue and perpetuate the enslavement of the peoples, only as world fascism. Fascism is not a new system. It is the most brutal and horrid form which decaying imperialism itself assumes in the period of its general and permanent crisis.

Hitler was the inevitable conclusion and culmination of the policies which British and American imperialists followed all these years. He is the product of the whole development

of imperialism in crisis. Every time Hitler speaks on the Radio, the burden of his screech is only one. Every time he addresses himself to his blood brothers, the imperialists on the opposite side, he shrieks: "What are you doing? Have you gone crazy? You are handing over the whole of Europe to Bolshevism. You are paving the way for world Communism and for our common doom." The moral is clear.

There are only two destinies that face world imperialism, today, which are being decided on the battlefields of the people's war. World imperialism can survive only as world fascism in which the British and American imperialists became junior partners of Hitler and his gang, while whole of mankind becomes their chained slave. The other alternative is annihilation of fascism and liquidation of world imperialism as a whole, which is world liberation. There is no such thing as a third—as an imperialist strategy or alternative. Everything that British and American imperialists do to pursue imperialist policies of world domination, of retaining their empire is an objective aid to the fascist strategy from within the people's camp. It is just on these things that Hitler relies upon for his victory, for strategy of world enslavement.

PROLETARIAN COUNTER-STRATEGY

Such is the desperate strategy of a doomed class. It cannot succeed. It is opposed by the grand strategy of the world proletariat, planned by its great leader, Comrade Stalin. It is being carried out by the workers and the peoples of the entire world in this great war of liberation. The people are determined that fascism and world imperialism must die, that people may live and mankind create a new world.

In this strategy, Hitler-fascism, the leader of the fascist gangsters is the chief enemy. He is the most powerful among them. His collapse is the key to an all-round people's victory. The main blow is aimed against him by the unconquerable vanguard of the people's army itself—the Red Army and the Soviet people.

In the rear of the enemy rises the storm of people's revolt in the Nazi-occupied territories and in Germany itself.

Peoples' mobilisation in England and America ensures that production base of the main armies is sustained and simultaneous auxiliary blows are delivered against Hitler on 'second front' in Europe.

Japan's treacherous tide will be rolled back by the joint struggle of the Chinese, Indian, Burmese, Malayan, Indonesian and Filipino peoples supported by the Soviet and American armies. Hitler's side-strokes in the Middle East are stopped by the free alliance with the Iranian and the Arabian peoples.

The people's grand strategy is based on the simple hard fact that though the armies of fascism have scored initial advantages, the mighty front of the peoples of the world is unconquerable. It has giant resources in men and material. It has an incomparable leader, the Red Army and the Soviet people.

Nothing on earth can prevent the victory of this people's grand alignment against the vanguard of world imperialism and counter-revolution, except treachery on the part of some of those who yet stand at the head of the people in powerful sectors of the front, except their refusal to liberate the peoples of colonies to participate in the battles, except their failure to co-ordinate the various operations in the grand strategy. And these difficulties will arise because the governments of Britain and America are yet manned by imperialists who dream of saving their world empires by the backdoor. But the peoples of the world are realising more and more what it would mean to them and to the entire world if they fail in smashing these difficulties, the vacillation and sabotage of the imperialists who today stand in the joint front of governments ranged against the Hitlerite criminals.

For victory, a people's victory or slavery, fascist slavery, which is worse than death—these are the only alternatives which today face all mankind.

ANTI-FASCIST FRONT OF GOVERNMENTS

The formation of the anti-Hitler front of governments was the expression of the transformation of the imperialist war into a people's war. It is the concrete form in which the crisis and split in the camp of world imperialism becomes manifest. But the reality behind it, the revolutionary force which makes it move and act as the instrument of the destruction of fascism and the liberation of the world is the worldwide unity of the people, headed by the Soviet Union.

Inside the front of governments, the U.S.S.R. alone has positive liberationist aims in the people's war. The U.S.S.R. alone is a truly people's government. The other governments

of U.S.A. and Great Britain are yet imperialist governments. They are committed to continue the war to a finish against the fascist powers but they have by no means accepted the war aims of the people. But their very existence in the front becomes the means of defeating the imperialist policies which these governments still attempt to pursue. The growing unity of the people nationally and internationally round the common aim of annihilating fascism and of world liberation ensures this. As the war progresses, the people's mobilisation grows stronger. The balance shifts inside the front more and more decisively in favour of the people and the Soviet Union and against the imperialists. This is really the meaning of what Comrade Molotov emphasised before the Three Power Conference in Moscow in October last year :

"The political significance of this Conference lies in this that now the enslaved peoples of Europe under fascist regime see a powerful front of freedom-loving nations headed by the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the U.S.A. rising to smash the intentions of Hitlerites against them. This is one of the most vivid and concrete evidences of the collapse to the general plan of Hitler, who counted on being able to turn the war into a crusade against Bolshevism and hoped to continue his former tactic of disposing of his enemies one by one. It never had to deal with such a mighty force as that of the Red Army and its such mighty resistance. We do not doubt that our struggle on this anti-fascist front will rapidly gain in strength and now at last the enslaved nations will find ways and means to wipe from the face of the earth the Nazi monster. To the Soviet Union has fallen the lot of saving these nations, aiding them in their bitter struggle against Hitlerism. A time will come when the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, headed by their great leader, J. V. Stalin, will undoubtedly liberate not only the peoples of Europe, but also of the entire world who so well understand and appreciate our intentions."

DEFEATING ENEMIES OF LIBERATION

The people in every country not only understand and appreciate these intentions, but are moving into action under the leadership of their Communist Parties to realise the liberationist aims of the Soviet Union by achieving the widest national unity and peoples' mobilisation. The selfish imperialist policies which the bourgeois governments in the anti-fascist front follow, weaken common action and endanger the

people's aims. If allowed to prevail, they would lead to the defeat and not victory of the people's war. In every country broad national unity of all those who stand for the utter destruction of fascism and for people's liberation is being formed. People's mobilisation is growing stronger and is driving the wedge firmly in the division which is taking place in the ranks of the imperialist ruling class, isolating the pro-fascist and reactionaries.

The turn in the war, from the imperialist to the people's, dashed to pieces the fundamental aims of the non-fascist imperialists and now the very logic of the people's war drives them away from carrying out of their imperialist plans, the very existence of the anti-fascist front binds them down, the hands of their own people rise to stop them because the carrying out of the imperialist policies means losing the war! The struggle for defeating imperialist policies becomes a part and parcel of the struggle to defeat fascism itself. This is the nemesis facing British and American imperialism.

The imperialist governments entered into an alliance with the U.S.S.R. and became a party to the anti-fascist front, through imperialist motives of course—to escape surrendering to Hitler, to be able to salvage as much of the Empire as possible. But world events, today's history has already reached a stage where not imperialist motives but the logic of the people's war is deciding its future course.

The imperialist rulers of the world are no more making history. They are being yoked to its chariot. The course is new—the people's war. The actors are new—peoples and nations. It is they who are getting into stride. It is these mighty forces that will shape world events more and more. What we have to see now is how this is being done throughout the world.

(Written in February 1942)

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

FOR VICTORY OVER HITLER IN THIS YEAR—1942

All the liberty-loving nations have united against German imperialism. Their eyes are turned towards the Soviet Union. The heroic struggle that the peoples of our country are waging for their freedom, honour and independence has aroused the admiration of all progressive mankind. The peoples of all the liberty-loving countries look upon the Soviet Union as the force capable of saving the world from the Hitlerite plague.

—May Day Order, 1942.

(We are reproducing below the leading article of the May issue of the *Communist International* published in Moscow. This is specially addressed to the Soviet, British, European and American Workers. But the lesson for us, workers and people of India, China and of the Asiatic countries is quite clear. Firstly, the freedom front of the Asiatic peoples in their struggle against Jap-fascist invaders is indissolubly linked up with the anti-Hitler front of the European and American people led by the Soviet Union. Secondly, it is the responsibility of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, "to urge and activise all sections of the people, to rally them in the struggle against the invader and day after day to enhance the United Anti-Fascist National Front.")

May Day, 1942, comes in a year of greatest historic decisions. This year, May Day is more than a day when the working class reviews its forces. It is a day of the mobilisation of every force of the nations embattled against Hitler in a life and death struggle.

This year, 1942, the peoples address their first May Day greetings to the Red Army, to the great Soviet people upon whom their eyes are fixed, to the people which holds the outposts in this war of liberation against the mechanised savagery of the Nazi murderers.

WORLD FRONT OF STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY AND PROGRESS

The issue at stake is not only the destiny of any one nation or any one class. The liberty and independence of all nations are at stake. It is a question of saving them from the mortal foes who are thrown into fury at the very sound of such words as the rights of man, liberty and democracy.

This struggle for the very foundations of human development is forging a new and powerful realisation of the solidarity of all nations. In the past when the workers demonstrated on May Day for the ideal of international solidarity, when their call to the unity of all toilers rang across the frontiers, this idea often evoked misunderstanding and indeed hostility among other sections of the population. *Today the idea of the world front of struggle for liberty and progress is beginning to penetrate the most remote corner of the earth.*

The worker who is tending the machine, the scientist secluded in his study or research worker in the laboratory, the peasant and writer, the teacher and handicraftsman, the physician and artist—all are beginning to realise with growing clarity that Hitler imperils their very lives and existence, and it is a question of saving from the barbarity of German fascism the fruits of their labour, the free spirit and progress in all fields of human endeavour. On the shores of the Seine and Mississippi, the Yangtse and the Thames, the people are becoming evermore aware that the air they breathe can only be purified, and man rejoice in life, when German fascism is utterly destroyed and reduced to nought.

In their own vital interests the peoples must do everything within human power to achieve victory.

HITLER CAN AND MUST BE ANNIHILATED IN 1942

By his bragging announcements of a 'Spring' offensive, Hitler seeks to intimidate the nations and wrest the initiative from them. But the Red Army will not let the initiative fall from its hands and is thus showing the peoples that Hitler is not so strong after all. In Germany itself the ground is beginning to be cut from under Hitler's feet. Famine, that terrible spectre and its inevitable concomitants, disease and epidemics, have found their way to the Reich. Physical and spiritual exhaustion, war weariness, have become a direct menace to the

Hitler regime. The shortage of raw materials and the strain of Germany's technical and economic apparatus, are making themselves felt more and more. The spectre of the defeat of 1918 hovers over Hitler Germany and the fascist ringleaders are no longer able to conceal their anxiety.

If the nations avail themselves of the present possibilities and rise to inflict a blow, Hitler Germany will collapse for all its tanks and planes, despite all its terror and foul propaganda. Its collapse will come much sooner than visualised by people who fail to differentiate between the apparent and the real. It is for this reason that Hitler and his clique are resorting to every means and method to inspire fear and horror before the fascist machine of terror and war. It is for this reason that the Nazis seek to feed and enhance the misgivings, doubts and fear to act. It is for this reason that they would extend the influence of elements who counsel the peoples that we must still wait, we must play for time and be careful not to squander our forces.

Therefore, all hesitation and doubt, every procrastination and delay of the decisive offensive are today the Nazis' best ally. Hitler counts on winning time to muster his last but still considerable forces for a desperate plunge. Hitler hopes that this attack will perhaps afford him the last chance of breaking through to new sources of raw materials and will thus enable him to emerge from the stalemate in which he is now locked. It rests with the nations to frustrate this new gamble of adventurism doomed to collapse and to put a speedy end to the detested war of Hitler's making.

The interests of all nations imperatively demand that 1942 become the year of the final decision. The militancy of the working class on May Day will serve as a message to all who still wait and hesitate. 1942 must become the year of the debacle of Hitlerism. The nations must enter 1943 without Hitler and without Hitler's war. The time of waiting is past and the hour of action has struck.

We must say to all cautious calculators who are for ever counting up the reserves of man-power and resources, concocting all manner of combinations in time and space only to come to the conclusion that Hitler is doomed anyway, so why should we precisely at this moment risk our lives; to all these past masters of passivity we must say: certainly the reserves of man-power and raw materials are of enormous importance and indeed space and time are vital factors, and as far as Hitler

is concerned the war is hopeless. But do not forget: if the reserves are kept back too long, and space and time are not utilised for struggle, all these factors may well lose their importance. And those who are repelled at the thought of sacrifices entailed in the struggle, those who place all their hopes on dragging out the war, may themselves turn out to be the victims of this procrastination, of the famine, mounting hardships and endless torment of the harassing war.

THE BEACON LIGHT OF SOVIET HEROISM

Lessons should be drawn from the example of the Red Army and the great Soviet Union. The vast and inexhaustible reserves have indeed greatly helped the Soviet people in the struggle and have proved fatal to Hitler, but only because the Soviet people, under any circumstances and any situation, never gave up the fight, only because every minute was used for bold and dauntless, skilful and heroic battle with the enemy.

Neither space, time nor nature have conquered Hitler in Russia. The Soviet people beat him back and continue to smash Hitler's hordes. The miracle of Moscow is but the heroism, fortitude and death-defying spirit of the people of the Soviet Union.

Machines and motors are indeed important, as are raw materials and reserves, but it is men, their enthusiasm and supreme spirit of self-sacrifice that decide the outcome.

The examples set by the Soviet people and its Red Army stand out on May Day like a beacon light illumining the path and calling the peoples to feats of bravery.

Lack of resolution will only prolong the suffering and torment caused by the war. Bravery, daring, action and struggle with every possible means and force at your disposal—such are the dictates of the times. This is the battle-cry, the fighting message of May Day, 1942.

WORKING CLASS—LEADER OF ANTI-FASCIST NATIONAL FRONT

And it is primarily the working class which is destined to sound this message and to translate this fighting spirit into deeds. In 1942, which must become the year of the great historic decision, a special and hitherto unknown responsibility devolves on the working class. Scores of years of difficult

struggles, of overcoming thousands of obstacles, of breaking a tenacious resistance, were required for the working class, to attain even part of its just rights. At present, in this world struggle against the most reactionary, vile and sanguinary tyranny, the working folk of town and country, the wide mass of the peoples, indeed the entire nations look with great expectations to their working classes.

Time and again, and particularly in the years of struggle against fascism, the workers demonstrated that they are the truest sons of their people, the staunchest champions of liberty and the homeland, and that the working class is the backbone of the nation. The workers, who, unlike the pseudo-patriots do not advertise their national feelings, defend their native land with their blood and lives. There is no people today which does not ponder over the fact that in the Soviet Union, which is ruled by the workers and peasants, there is not a single Quisling, that in the country where the working class has left its noble imprint on the entire structure of society, the moral and political unity of the people remains as firm as ever.

May Day this year will find the workers imbued not only with the consciousness of their might and dignity, but with the consciousness of their great responsibility as the foremost fighters of their nation.

The working class has grown in stature in the course of the struggle. Its vanguard is imbued with the realisation that it falls primarily to the working class to urge and activise all the sections of the people, to rally them in the struggle against the invader and day after day to enhance the united anti-fascist national front.

Headed by its vanguard, the working class will be able to put an end to the fatal moods in its own ranks of waiting and flinching from active struggle. The working class will be fortified in its realisation that the hour has struck for decisive action and that the time has come for all forces to launch a counter-offensive against Hitler.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN WORKERS IN THE VAN

No one doubts that the American and British workers will, on May Day, pledge themselves to vie with their Soviet comrades in war production, to produce more tanks, aircrafts and weapons against Hitler. No one doubts that they will strive for the highest degree of organisation and unity in order to

mobilise every section of the working people and every section of the population for victory over Hitler. No one doubts that they will affirm their resolution not only to produce arms but to use them against the foe, not only to forge arms, but also to bear arms in their people's cause.

GUERRILLAS IN THE OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

The workers in the Hitler-occupied countries will affirm their determination to fulfil their proletarian and national duty. Every ounce of energy and every bit of skill will be concentrated by them to disrupt war production and the transport of military supplies for their malignant foe. By diverse means, including fires and explosions, they will destroy machinery and equipment working for the invaders. They are aware that the time has come for active struggle of the masses, for the organisation of a powerful strike movement against the fascist enslavers. They will realise, lastly, the need and real possibility of the masses offering armed resistance to the enemy. In Yugoslavia the guerilla struggle is assuming the character and scope of a real popular war. In Northern Norway guerilla detachments have undertaken a series of successful operations. A guerilla movement is arising in France, particularly in the Seine and Loire department.

Thus reality itself is clearly refuting the totally incorrect assertion that a guerilla war allegedly requires definite natural conditions—woods, bogs, impassable mountains and that guerilla warfare in densely-populated sections of Europe is unthinkable. This contention is all too similar to the treacherous lies of French capitulators-generals who would have the people think that an open city like Paris cannot be defended. Yet the Soviet people have demonstrated to the world that every open city becomes a powerful buttress if its defenders are stout-hearted and brave. The same is true of guerilla warfare which in every occupied land can greatly undermine the power of the enemy by opening the way for the armed insurrection of the people. The tempo and scope of the armed resistance of the people to Hitler's butchers will, to a large extent, depend on the working class of the occupied lands.

STRIKE IN HITLER'S REAR

In the countries which the rulers have converted into vassal states of Hitler and whose people are forced to suffer hunger and bloodshed for the sake of Hitler's war, the workers will deem it their prime task to show the country the way out of the war, to point the way to salvation from the clutches of death and fetters of slavery imposed by the detested German "Ally." The workers of these countries will seek to induce the masses to refuse to sacrifice their lives and fortunes for Hitler. Not a single crumb of bread for Hitler's locusts, not a drop of blood for Hitler, that mortal enemy of the nations—this will be the battle-cry of the workers in the countries "allied" to Hitler Germany. The workers of these countries will make their contribution to the cause of the liberation of the peoples by sabotage and desertion, by strikes and the disorganisation of production.

MESSAGE TO THE GERMAN WORKERS

This year there is a special message to the German working class. Let the German workers on this May Day hear the voice of their class brothers, let them hear the constantly repeated warning, the burning question which comes from all corners of the world: where is the German working class, where are the German workers? There was a time when you marched in the foremost ranks, when you reflected the great ideas of Marx and Engels. Among your leaders were Bebel and Liebknecht. In your mighty hands we felt the proletarian force and solidarity. But today? With your hands Hitler is waging war against the socialist state of the workers and peasants. With your hands you are manufacturing the weapons for the blood-thirsty murderers of the workers. Can it be that you German workers deem it compatible with your honour, your concentration camps, and the degradation of the working class to the status of mute cattle, obediently following the criminal Fuehrer and his avid and rapacious adventurers.

It is an irrefutable fact that millions of German workers are opposed to the fascist regime, that they condemn Hitler's war against the Socialist State of the workers and peasants. But today it is no longer a matter of sentiment but of historic decision. Hitler has taken millions of workers from industry and flung them into the army. He is driving them to

fight the Soviet Union, condemning them to bleed to death in his mad "Spring Offensive." Not only these workers but the entire German people stand on the brink of the abyss into which Hitler is thrusting the last sons of the mothers of Germany in order to prolong for at least a short space of time his own miserable existence. The preparations which Hitler has undertaken for his last and foulest of all crimes must impel the German working class to action. Today the German proletariat must overcome passivity in its ranks and take into its own hands the salvation of the German nation.

FIGHT FOR A NEW AND HAPPY GERMANY

It is both necessary and possible that the German workers, carrying with them the widest sections of the German people, enter the path of decisive struggle against Hitler's war and against the Hitler regime. It is both necessary and possible that the German workers refuse to bear this tormenting servitude for the sake of war, that they work slower every day and sabotage production. It is both necessary and possible that they utilise the shortage of raw materials and wear of machinery to cause hundreds and thousands of stoppages in the work, that they organise militant action and strikes in industry.

Terror is not an insurmountable obstacle. No one would dare to claim that the Nazi terror is milder in Norway and France than in Germany proper. Yet the Norwegian and French workers find the courage to wage by every means the struggle against the Nazi executioners. *If the German workers really understand to what a doom Hitler is dragging the German nation with such feverish haste they must come to their senses and show the German people the path of salvation, to the termination of war, to a new and happy Germany.*

The German workers and the German people can be confident that Hitler's defeat and the overthrow by the German people of the shameful fascist tyranny will spell Germany's salvation. The workers of the whole world and the nations are determined once and for all to win a lasting and durable peace and seek only to destroy Hitler fascism. The workers of all countries await and desire to see Germany enter the commonwealth of the world's nations, which see their salvation and the salvation of the German nation not in war and destruction but in constructive labour.

May Day, 1942, will recall to the German workers the glorious days of the past struggle and will serve to call the German working class to, resolutely combat against Hitler's war and Hitler's slavery.

UNITE TO WIN THE SACRED WAR OF LIBERATION AGAINST FASCISM

History affords moments that leave an indelible place in the memory of humanity, moments that signify not merely a step but a leap forward, and like lightning illuminate the outlines of the future. Such an event was the great battle of Moscow. With rapt attention all humanity watched how Stalin's military genius led the Red Army in the decisive battle against the fascist monster. The Red Army won. It hurled back the "invincible" fascist hordes, it converted Hitler's flaunted promise of victory into dismal defeat. *May Day must become the day of mobilisation of the working-class forces of all countries to bring about a similar turn in the sacred liberation war waged by the peoples against Hitler slavery.*

For a whole generation May Day was a day when the worker fortified his faith in his own strength and felt himself at one with the millions of his class brothers, a day when he felt conscious of belonging to a mighty militant body. The significance of May Day 1942 is incomparably greater; this year it is a day of rallying all people, of uniting all honest men who cherish freedom for the struggle in defence of their decent existence, for the sacred liberation war against fascism, for the cause of all mankind. On this day the sense of human dignity, courage and determination of every fighters must overcome all apprehension. The magnificence of the common task must relegate to the background all petty egoistic motives. *Unity of all progressive and freedom-loving forces must lead to the supreme determination to act.*

Unity of the working class, unity of the peoples uniting the struggle of the peoples with unparalleled struggle of the Soviet people and its Red Army—such is the battlecry and the slogan of May Day 1942.

No more waiting but action. Forward to the struggle against blood-thirsty, bestial fascism.

Forward to the great battle for liberty, to the smashing of the weakened front of fascist tyranny.

Put an end to passivity and hesitation.

The war must end in the victory of the freedom-loving peoples in this year, 1942.

Hitler can be destroyed in 1942.

Such is the chief slogan of May Day and its realisation is the guarantee of the victory of the peoples.

STALIN

THE TWO CAMPS

(From Stalin's report delivered at the celebration meeting of the Moscow Soviet of Working People's Deputies and Party and public organisations at Moscow on November 6, 1942).

IT MAY now be considered indisputable that in the course of war imposed upon the United Nations by Hitlerite Germany a radical demarcation of forces and the formation of two opposite camps has taken place—the camp of the Italo-German coalition and the camp of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. It is equally indisputable that these two opposite camps are guided by two different and opposite programmes of action.

The programme of action of the Italo-German coalition may be described by the following points :

Racial hatred, domination by chosen nations, subjugation of other nations and seizure of their territories, economic enslavement of subdued nations and spoliation of their national wealth, destruction of their democratic liberties and institutions, the institution of the Hitlerite regime everywhere.

The programme of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is :

Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of the enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to the nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of their democratic liberties, destruction of their Hitlerite regime.

The effect of the programme of action of the Italo-German coalition has been that all the occupied countries of Europe :

Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece and the occupied regions of the U.S.S.R. are turning with hatred on the Italo-German tyrants, are causing all the damage they can to the Germans and their allies, and are waiting for a favourable opportunity to take revenge on their conquerors for the humiliations and violations they are now suffering. In this connection, one of the characteristic features of the present moment is the progressively growing isolation of the Italo-German coalition and depletion of its moral and political reserves in Europe, its growing weakness and disintegration.

The effect of the programme of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has been that all the occupied countries in Europe are full of sympathy for the members of this coalition and are preparing to render them all the help of which they are capable. In this connection, another characteristic feature of the present moment is that the moral and political reserve of this coalition are growing from day to day in Europe. *And not only in Europe but all over, this coalition is progressively winning millions of sympathisers ready to join it in its fight against Hitlerite Germany.*

R. PALME DUTT

THE ANGLO-SOVIET AGREEMENT

THE cause of world unity against Fascism has^{*} made a giant advance in the past month. The announcement on June 11 of the British-Soviet Treaty of Alliance, signed on May 26, confirming and deepening the Pact of a year ago, and extending its significance to a long-term perspective of co-operation of the two Powers in the organisation of world peace for a whole generation ahead; the parallel close understanding reached in the Soviet-American negotiations at the beginning of June; and the simultaneous announcement on behalf of the Governments of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union that "full understanding" has been reached with regard to "the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942"—these constitute a landmark of world history which will profoundly influence the outcome of the present war and the whole future course of world politics and of the modern era. Opportunities have been opened which will be received with deep and heartfelt welcome by the peoples of the entire world, and which must now be made the signal for action.

All future questions and tasks need now to be reviewed in the light of these agreements. At the heart of the present understandings reached is the practical understanding for combined military action in 1942, the fulfilment of which will govern the realisation of all the further aims. This declaration of unity of strategy and undertaking for action in 1942 is the hard core of the agreements reached. After a long, chequered and controversial background during these past twelve months, the objective of "the Second Front in Europe in 1942" has received official recognition, and becomes thereby the declared policy of the Government, the nation and of all parties and organisations supporting the Government and the war effort. This is a great step forward, and the very delay in reaching it makes the urgency in translating it into action the greater. By this undertaking the basis has been laid for establishing the full combined strategy and action of the United Nations dur-

ing the second half of this critical year of the supreme battle against Fascism. From the moment of this decision the old controversy on this issue belongs to the past. Only the practical problems and tasks for the speedy, effective and united fulfilment of this undertaking must now concentrate all our attention and engage our entire effort.

There is no time to be lost in translating into action the agreements reached. We are entering the second year since the establishment of British-Soviet unity. We are entering the seventh month of the decisive year 1942. The widespread sense of growing hope and confidence engendered by the strengthened unity of the alliance and by its increased striking power, with the consequent expectation of combined offensive action, must not blind us to the gravity of the present war situation: the formidable military and mechanical power of Nazism hurling at this moment the main mass of its forces and of the forces of its satellites against the Soviet armies at Khar'kov, Sebastopol or Leningrad; advance of the Nazi offensive towards Egypt; Japanese pressure on China and daily closer threat to India, with the deteriorating political situation in India; the landing on the Aleutian Islands; and the evident seriousness of the shipping position. The confidence that can today be justly felt leaves no room for easy-going optimism; and any illusions that a diplomatic agreement is equivalent to military victory need to be quickly replaced by the stern recognition that the conversations at London and Washington are the prelude to heavy conflicts and the most intense phase of the war. The advocates of the Second Front in Europe have never hidden the truth that the path of the Second Front is a rough and thorny path, which will call for heavy sacrifices and the utmost determination; but it is the sure and necessary path to victory, with the minimum final cost.

We have spent heavily that expensive commodity, time, during these twelve months since June, 1941. The decision in principle for combined action has still to overcome the many obstacles of practice, rendered in some respects the more considerable and arduous by the length of warning given to Hitler to prepare, and by the fact that the prolonged preceding division of policy and the consequent inevitably necessary political fight has resulted in the peculiar situation that the strategic decision has had to be reached and announced beforehand in a public diplomatic document. For these disadvantages in entering on the Second Front, which will make the cost greater,

we have to thank the Halifaxes, the Kemsleys, the military die-hards and all those reactionaries who by their resistance retard the necessary decision. We must make up for these disadvantages by our response now. The decision in principle for the necessity of the establishment of the Second Front in Europe this year has at last been reached. But its speedy execution in time to affect the battles now opening will require every ounce of united effort. The practical tasks of preparation—military, political and economic in respect of shipping, use of shipping and extension of shipbuilding, mobilisation of man-power and woman-power, maximum utilisation of all our resources, strengthening of leadership and strengthening of national unity—stand in the forefront of urgency.

The immediate urgency of these practical tasks prevents more than rapid attention being given to the wider significance of the Treaty which has now been signed between Britain and the Soviet Union. And yet the magnitude of the change and new alignment which is embodied in this Treaty is so great, its bearing on the whole future so profound, and its consequent significance as the setting of the framework of the present struggle so far-reaching, that the understanding of this change and the new long-term course to which the destinies of the British people are now committed is an essential part of political preparedness for the present struggle. Twenty years is a long time for the lifetime of those now living; it is a considerable time in the rapid tempo of modern development; and in this era of transition from the old order to the new it gives time for much to happen which, if we play our part, can now happen under more favourable conditions for the advance of the cause of human liberation, both for the people of this country and for the people of the world, thanks to this Treaty.

It so happens that this month's issue of the *Labour Monthly* is the twenty-first anniversary issue of our journal since its foundation in July, 1921. We can be happy and proud that the twenty-first anniversary of our journal should coincide with so signal an advance of the principles for which it has consistently fought, principles of closer international co-operation and especially of the friendship and unity of the British and Soviet peoples. When our first number appeared, the civil wars promoted by foreign interventionists against the young Socialist Republic had not yet reached their conclusion; but the main victory had already been won by the fighting heroism

of the Soviet people against immeasurable odds, and by the international solidarity of the working people of all countries, including the splendid role of the Councils of Action of the British working-class movement which laid the foundations of British-Soviet friendship and dealt a blow to the war-plots of the reactionary anti-Soviet interventionists, forerunners of the modern Munichites.

There followed the long chapter of chequered Anglo-Soviet relations during these twenty years, whose antagonistic course has been the index of the world situation. Reaction and economic delay at home; refusal of working-class unity; the growth of Fascism in Europe; support of reaction abroad and hostility to the Soviet Union: these were the characteristics of these inter-war years of disastrous memory in the history of this country, the years of Baldwins and MacDonalds and Chamberlains. Through all these years the reactionaries in control of affairs in this country continued to pursue their hostility to the Soviet Union with the same implacable and tenacious hatred which a century and a half ago their forerunners had meted out to the French Revolution and its influence throughout the world. Through all these years the Anglo-Soviet antagonism continued the pivot of world politics; and its consequences wrought immeasurable harm for both, the British and the Russian people, as for the whole world situation, culminating in the present war.

On the basis of the Anglo-Soviet antagonism German Fascism climbed to power in the international arena, and was able to advance from an originally disarmed condition to renew the world menace of German militarism which had been seemingly crushed at the cost of ten million lives twenty years before. On the basis of the Anglo-Soviet antagonism in the international arena, and on the basis of the division of the working class in Germany, Fascism originally climbed to power within Germany. On the basis of the Anglo-Soviet antagonism, dangling before the gaze of the besotted Munichites the glittering prospectus of the grand crusade against the Soviet Union to cover their designs against the British Empire and against the freedom of every independent nation in the world, Fascism penetrated the inmost citadels and commanding circles of every leading country outside the Soviet Union (where its agents were promptly ferreted out and handed over to stern justice); built up its armed strength to create the most formidable and ruthless military machine yet known in the re-

cords of any conquering empire ; domineered over international politics ; extended its rule of oppression and barbarism and swept forward with seemingly resistless advance, until it was able to threaten both the Soviet Union and the peoples of the West.

It is today universally recognised that if the Anglo-Soviet Alliance, which was originally first proposed by the Communist Partp of Great Britain in the spring of 1935, had been adopted earlier, it could have prevented the present war. It is today universally recognised—as the recent publication in this country of the book of the former American Ambassador to Moscow, Joseph E. Davies, has emphasised—that the Soviet Union correctly estimated the world menace of Nazism and its aggression from the day that Hitler came to power ; correctly estimated the measures necessary to combat it, which could have won success had not the Munichite policies in control in Britain and France prevented the fulfilment of those measures and compelled the temporary alternative weapon of the non-aggression Pact to defeat Munichism ; correctly prepared and carried through the serious and heavy rearmament from 1933 onwards which is today bearing the brunt and saving the world from Fascism ; correctly diagnosed and liquidated the Fifth Column long before its nature was understood by the Western world, in those trials which at the time won the uncomprehending abuse and denunciation, in place of the gratitude, of Western publicists ; and correctly carried through those strategic measures in 1939-41 which broke the weight of the Nazi offensive in 1941 and helped to prevent the capture of Leningrad and Moscow in the autumn of that year. It is today universally recognised that the Munichite policies were fatal and a betrayal of the interests of the British people, and that, had their culmination in the Finland adventure and planned armed expedition for war in support of Mannerheim against the Soviet Union in 1940 reached fruition, it would have meant war in support of Fascism against the main antagonist of Fascism, opening the way to the world victory of Fascism and the destruction of the independence of the British people.

Yet everyone of these issues required at the time a severe and arduous against-the-stream fight on the part of the left to spread understanding, in the face of the deluge of reactionary calumny, prejudice and ignorance. Today every one of these issues, which were at the time so controversial, is already becoming the commonplace of the historian, so that younger

people will soon be wondering how on earth their predecessors could have gone astray on such obvious issues. The wheel has come full circle. The Anglo-Soviet Alliance, which was previously rejected, is now universally acclaimed; while the remaining cliques of Munichites and pro-Fascist reactionaries who from their holes and corners still seek to denigrate the Soviet Union and weaken Anglo-Soviet unity are now becoming recognised as traitors and enemies to their own nation, the counterpart of the Quislings and Fifth Column of all countries. The united action of Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States is now becoming recognised as constituting the indispensable basis, the main pillar and bastion, not only for the alliance in the cause of freedom against Fascism, and for the immediate defeat of Fascism, but for the future organisation of world peace and world collaboration. With this the perspective of a new era in world politics comes in view.

For British policy the change of alignment represented by the Treaty is far reaching; and we can pay tribute to the bold realism of those Conservative leaders, represented by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden who could thus plainly recognise the realities of power in the modern world situation, irrespective of political colour, and draw the practical conclusions, in place of pursuing of self-destructive follies of the old Munichite policies. The *Daily Telegraph* has described this alliance as an alliance without precedent:—

The Swedish comment that Britain has become a European Power in the widest sense does not fully express the break with precedent. British interests were as widely European as they could be in the later years of Louis XIV, at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, or at Versailles in 1919.

It may seem to neutral opinion that in the past Britain only entered European affairs to join a coalition of weak Powers against a Roi Soleil or a Napoleon aiming at the domination of the Continent, and that the change now is the formation of an alliance of the strongest Powers. In fact, the divergence from precedent is much greater, and the policy of another scale and scope from any we have followed hitherto. Before now we have formed alliances with great empires for the defeat of aggression, agreeing to make no separate peace. The distinction of this alliance is that it will not terminate on the signing of a peace treaty. Throughout our history British policy has avoided committing itself to long-term responsibility for the affairs of Europe. Neither the statesmen of Vienna nor the statesmen of Versailles linked Britain, by bond of individual

action, with "the organisation of security and economic prosperity" in Europe.

We have pledged ourselves with Russia to an enterprise never before attempted. (*Daily Telegraph*, June 13, 1942.)

The change is the reflection of the changed position of Britain in the world. Isolation died with the ending of the old nineteenth-century world monopoly and secure world-dominant position. The Anglo-German antagonism which dominated the first two decades of the twentieth century was met by the building of a temporary war coalition of the old type which fell apart after victory. Thereafter a period of confusion followed. The initial attempt at a new form of organisation through the League of Nations failed, since the League of Nations was in fact no international organisation, but in the first stage a league of victors, from which the strongest victor, the United States, broke away, so that it became an Anglo-French organ; while in the late stage when, with the entry of the Soviet Union, it began to show signs of functioning in an international fashion and serving as an international rallying ground against Fascist aggression the Anglo-Munichite reaction turned against it and broke it up. The apparent completeness of the victory of 1918 concealed the real weakness of Britain thereafter; hence for a time the old illusions of self-sufficiency and world isolationism survived in a tattered parody in the Munich policy. Munichism completely failed to recognise the changed relations of world power, despised and condemned collective security (which offered the best chance of survival for the weakened Britain), and still sought to dictate to all the countries of the world, to direct and control Nazi Germany, to hold aloof from the United States, to isolate and destroy the Soviet Union, and ended by isolating Britain before a powerful Nazi Germany dominating the European Continent.

Experience thus drove home the necessity of an alternative policy and a basic new alignment for Britain within a long-term alliance or wider system. For a time the attempt was made to find a solution by building on co-operation with the United States; and the conception of an exclusive Anglo-American domination, or domination of "the Anglo-Saxon world" (in Lord Halifax's expression), found favour, and still finds favour, with a certain circle. But it soon became clear that such an exclusive partnership meant inevitably the increasing subordination of the weaker British partner to the

more powerful American partner.¹ France had collapsed. The only alternative within the traditional circle of relationships, the Munichite alternative of alliance with Nazi Germany, now meant complete surrender and subordination to Nazi world domination. In this situation the possibility of long-term co-operation with the Soviet Union, alongside the balancing co-operation with the United States, became more and more clearly revealed, no longer as some supposed panacea of the left, but as the rock of salvation from the standpoint of Conservative statesmanship.

The tripartite collaboration of Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States, the three main centres of world power after the downfall of Fascism, becomes the indispensable basis for the organisation of world peace and security, which is indispensable for the weakened power of Britain after the war. Hence the conception of Britain's pivotal role of co-operation with the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and with the United States, on the other, becomes the key to the present dominant British policy. But the interest of the United States in Europe, still the central battleground of world political problems, is necessarily more limited than that of Britain and the Soviet Union. Hence the co-operation of Britain and the Soviet Union is necessarily drawn especially close. This finds expression in the twenty-year alliance of Britain and the Soviet Union, pending the organisation of a world system of security. Thus the interests of progressive democratic politics here coincide with the enlightened calculations of self-interest of ruling-class politics or Conservative statesmanship in the present British-Soviet alignment. This is what gives the hope of greater strength and stability to the alliance.

But this alignment, which thus follows, not from sentiment (although deeply corresponding to the feelings of the peoples of both countries), but from a solid identity of interest, comprehensible to more far-seeing representatives of the ruling-class in Britain on the basis of a normal calculation of ruling-class politics or power-politics, carries with it important social and political consequences. For if we have² here, not merely a temporary war collaboration, but a serious and long-term international co-operation for a whole epoch ahead, then this affects the entire world situation and the position of Britain in the world situation. It would mean that Britain is ranged for a whole epoch of development with the progressive forces of the world. It would mean that for the first time

for a century and a half the role of Britain as the rock of world counter-revolution comes to an end and passes out of the historical record. It would mean that the most favourable conditions are created for rapid progressive social and political development within Britain.

It cannot yet be said that such a perspective is certain, since this depends on the maintenance of a combination of political forces within Britain favourable to upholding, carrying forward and sincerely fulfilling the alliance. The disintegration of political stability in Britain and emergence of violent Fascist, counter-revolutionary or Munichite anti-Soviet forces to a dominant position would at once change the whole perspective. No paper document, but only the united will, political consciousness and active role of the people, and especially of the labour movement, can guarantee the outcome. There are still plenty of dangers in front. We have first to win the war against Fascism. We have to ensure that the Munichite and anti-Soviet plotters do not succeed in their aims of disrupting national unity during the war in order to destroy the present basis of the alliance and prepare the way for alternative policies. We have to ensure that the labour movement or the sections of the labour movement do not become the instrument of the Munichites for disrupting national unity, but that the labour movement plays the foremost role in maintaining the widest co-operation in action on the basis of the alliance and for the fulfilment of the Second Front. Given the realisation of these conditions in the present critical moment of supreme struggle, whose outcome will determine the future, very great opportunities open out for progressive advance in the whole future period on the basis of the extending collaboration of the progressive peoples of the world.

August 20, 1942.

[From the *Labour Monthly*].

R. PALME DUTT

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

THE final phase of the war against Fascism in Europe now draws close. The political successes of the Three-Power Conference, alongside the military successes of Allied arms, have strengthened all the favourable conditions for the supreme assault on the Nazi citadel and the complete destruction of Fascism. Everything must now be directed to this task. Neither the military achievement of the Red Army advance, nor the strengthened weight of Anglo-American air bombing, nor the signs of cracking within the camp of the Axis satellites and even within Nazi Germany, nor the glorious political perspective opened out by the Three-Power Conference decisions, nor the vast new problems of the world after the war which are already looming large, must for one moment blind us to this primary task of the decisive battle which is now before us. Fascism shall not escape. The hour of the vengeance of the peoples is at hand. Fascism is surrounded, weakened, outnumbered, out-gunned and out-manned ; but Fascism is not yet broken, has not yet played its last cards of political manoeuvre, has still to loose its last fury of dying terror ; Fascism has still to be finally beaten, smashed and destroyed, so that it shall never rise again. The final battles are indeed at last coming into view : but, as every responsible leader of the United Nations has given warning, we must be prepared for the prospect that the final battles may prove the heaviest, demanding the uttermost relentless determination to ensure that neither delay nor weakening shall rob mankind of the fullness of victory.

In this perspective the Three-Power Conference represents a landmark of the United Nations, comparable in significance with the formation of the alliance. The signal of the Three-Power Conference is the death-signal for Fascism. Its decisions have barred the political bolt-holes of escape which the friends of the monster were (and still are) working deviously to open. They have drawn the bonds of the alliance which the rats and vermin were (and still are) gnawing to undermine. The watchword of the Three-Power Conference is the watchword to strengthen the blows against Fascism, to con-

solidate the alliance, to combine the strategy, to hasten the ending of the war, to show no mercy to the Fascist enemy, to ensure the victory of democracy and of the freedom of nations, and to lay the foundations for the organisation of world peace. The decisions of the Three-Power Conference represent a victory for democracy, for the peoples, for the common man ; and a defeat for fascism, for the fifth column, for the enemies of the people. No international conference of modern times has been so fruitful, positive, so concrete and so constructive in its outcome.

Twelve years have passed since the first warning guns sounded the onset of the second world war, when the Japanese generals let loose pillage and murder in Manchuria, and the Western Powers began the repudiation of the League of Nations Covenant, under the guidance of a Simon and with the applause of an Amery, to leave the Chinese people to their fate. Ten years have passed since Hitler came to power, to be courted and fawned on by the statesmen and financiers of the West, who fell over themselves to help to build his armaments which have since laid waste the world. Seven years have passed since German and Italian Fascism, made insolent by success, turned their guns and their planes on Spanish Democracy, while the Pharisees of the West deprived Spanish Democracy of arms under the hypocritical shibboleth of "non-intervention." Five years have passed since the nethermost depth of Western statesmanship was plumbed at Munich, when the Four-Power Pact of Britain, France, Nazi Germany and Italian Fascism, was signed in the blood of dismembered Czechoslovakia, while the Soviet Union was excluded from their guilty councils.

What a change today ! The Three-Power Conference at Moscow represents the completion of the reversal of Munich. Only five years ago the representatives of Anglo-French reaction and of German and Italian Fascism met in the Nazi council-chambers of Munich to close the doors against the Soviet Union and to open the gates to war. For five years mankind has paid the penalty in torrents of blood and destruction and enslavement without equal in all the records of the nations. Today accredited delegates of the Governments of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, representing the mighty array of States and nations embattled against Fascism, have met in the halls of the Kremlin and the people's citadel of Moscow to pledge their word and deed in support

of "the fundamental principle that Fascism and all its evil influence and emanations shall be utterly destroyed." Through all the blood and tears and suffering, which have had to expiate past crimes, the wheel of history has indeed turned to some purpose.

The Three-Power Conference came at the right moment. The turn of the tide of the war, the extending military successes of the Allies, and the prospect of the final downfall of Fascism made essential a Conference to prepare the necessary combined strategy for victory and to agree on a common policy in answer to the new political problems which the advance of the Allied armies and the prospect of victory had brought into view. The unity of the alliance, which had been forged under the over-mastering compulsion of common peril, needed now to be carried forward to a unity for victory and for the positive achievement of common democratic aims. This task was no light one. Quebec and the sequel to Quebec had shown how grave was the danger of a continued separation of strategic planning and political approach. Events preceding the Conference underlined these dangers and the paramount necessity of a solution.

Fascism, driven back in the fields of battle, and faced with the overwhelming superiority of the United Nations, openly calculated on divergences in the alliance for its salvation. Nor was there lack of soil for the manoeuvres of the enemy. Powerful reactionary forces, the old isolationists and backers of Fascism, which had been acquiescent in the alliance during the moment of extreme military danger, and had been quiescent so long as the Nazi armies were advancing into the Soviet Union, now began to come out of their holes and resume their disruptive activities, as soon as the tide of the war had begun to turn, the menace of military defeat had receded into the distance, and the Red Army was advancing.

Thus, alongside and even because of the Allied military successes and the increasingly favourable conditions for final victory, with the consequent practical problems which required urgent attention, there was plenty of poison in the air which needed to be cleared. The Three-Power Conference tackled its task faithfully in consolidating the unity of the alliance against every disruptive force; and the world stands in debt to all the three statesmen and their Governments who made this success possible. Against all the poisonous and disruptive tendencies the Three-Power Conference came like a blast of

fresh air. Its outcome represented a victory against Fascism not less significant than a major victory on the battlefield. It brought discomfiture to the enemies of democratic victory, and renewed confidence and determination to all democrats and anti-Fascists. Much requires to be done to bring its decisions into practice, and to carry them forward; but a foundation has been laid.

From the outset, every attempt was made by hostile forces to hinder, delay or sabotage the Conference, to diminish its importance or restrict it to an impotent exploratory role before the meeting of the three Heads of Government; or to restrict its agenda. These attempts were defeated by the proceedings of the Conference. To the discomfiture of the advocates of its exploratory role, the Conference adopted definite and binding decisions on a series of important questions, which not only provide a valuable preliminary starting point for any future meeting of the Heads of Government, but already constitute a whole in themselves and a guide to action.

To the discomfiture of the mischief-makers, who sought to turn the agenda of the Conference to their points of would-be provocation about Poland or Finland or the Baltic peoples or the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the Conference in its decisions firmly concentrated its attention on the tasks of the war against Fascism and for democratic victory. To the discomfiture of the advocates of the "long, long war," the Conference came down explicitly and unequivocally for the shortening of the war by the closest combined military operations. To the discomfiture of the anti-democratic intriguers and devisers of reactionary strait-jackets for the European peoples, the conference laid down the most precise directions for the fullest democratic anti-Fascist development in all occupied countries even during military operations. To the discomfiture of the Isolationists, Munichites, despisers of collective security or advocates of an isolationist Anglo-American alliance, the Four-Power Declaration of the Conference pledged the joint leadership of Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States and China in establishing an international organisation of all peace-loving States, great or small, for international collaboration and the maintenance of peace.

All these represent important democratic victories on vital issues. The reception of the decisions is not less significant. They have received universal acclamation from all democratic opinion. They have been denounced by the Nazi press, which

banked on a negative outcome for the Conference. Hitler's subsequent speech, with its frantic proclamation of resistance to the last ("we shall never capitulate") revealed the consciousness of the blow which the Conference had dealt to the hopes of a way out through political manoeuvres or division of the Allies. Within the camp of the United Nations the only voice of criticism so far has come from relatively restricted quarters of the most extreme reactionaries, Isolationists, Munichites, elements of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States or similar groupings. It was noted that, amid the universal acclamation, the financial speculators on the Stock Exchange and Wall Street slumped on receipt of the news of the Moscow Conference decisions; while in the debate in Parliament the only opposition was expressed by the Munichite I.L.P., which had acclaimed Munich and Chamberlain with fervent adulation ("well done, thou good and faithful servant"), and now denounced the Moscow Conference decisions with corresponding emphasis ("there was no reason why the House should throw their hats in the air").

What of the future? It is not enough to acclaim the decisions of the Moscow Conference; it is necessary to ensure their fulfilment in action. Recent developments in this country, such as the release of Mosley or the reconstruction of the Government with the inclusion of the pro-Franco Lennox-Boyd, or the revival of Fascist activity in Allied-Occupied territory in Italy, or the exacerbation of the Lebanon crisis, illustrate how active the enemy manoeuvres continue, and how necessary it is to combat them. The fight for the principles adopted by the three Governments at Moscow has still to be carried through to completion.

The decisions of the Moscow Conference need to be made familiar to the widest sections of the people; for they place the most powerful weapons in the hands of all supporters of democratic victory. But these weapons need to be used. What is especially important for present purposes is to emphasise the significance of the main decisions as a guide to action on present issues, as well as for the whole future perspective.

The principal question before the Moscow Conference was that of military action for speedy victory. On this all else depends. Here it is essential to be clear what was decided,

and what remains to be done. The wording of the public statement is exact and precise :—

In the first place, there were frank and exhaustive discussions of the measures to be taken to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe.

Advantage was taken of the presence of military advisers, representing their respective chiefs of staff, in order to discuss definite military operations with regard to which decisions had been taken and which are already being prepared in order to create a basis for the military co-operation in the closest future between the three countries.

Here every word has its weight. "First place" was given to the military discussions. Common ground was the aim "to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe" by "closest military co-operation in the future" ("in the future"—that is, not already existing).

Does this mean that agreement was reached on the "measures to be taken to shorten the war," on the "definite military operations"? Here there were "frank and exhaustive discussions." Previously determined plans of operations, "with regard to which decisions had been taken," were reported and discussed. There is no record of agreement being reached on the basis of these plans, or an agreed common plan having been reached at the Conference. On every other declaration of the Conference agreement is specifically recorded: "the three Governments are in complete agreement" (Declaration on Italy), "have agreed" (Declaration on Austria), etc. The conclusion is clear. The fight for a united strategy was carried an enormous stage forward by the Moscow Conference, with the frank and exhaustive interchange of the responsible Government representatives and military experts. But it has still to be carried through to completion. The responsibility to ensure that our Government and the United States Government take with all speed the necessary "measures to shorten the war," in accordance with the aims agreed in principle at the Moscow Conference, rests with the peoples of this country and the United States.

With this must be taken the declarations in the speeches of Stalin and Churchill immediately following the Conference. Stalin stated in his anniversary speech :—

The opening of a real Second Front in Europe, which is not far off, will considerably hasten victory over

Hitlerite Germany and still further consolidate the comradeship-in-arms of the Allied countries.

Churchill stated in his Mansion House speech on November 9:—

1944 will see the climax of the European war.... The campaign of 1944 in Europe will be the most severe and, to the Western Allies, the most costly in life of any we have yet fought.... Battles far larger and more costly than Waterloo or Gettysburg will be fought.

To these declarations should be added the statement of Cordell Hull immediately following the Moscow Conference:—

In the military field decisions which may from time to time be improved had already been adopted.

It is essential that the present stage of the fight for the Second Front should be firmly grasped in the light of these statements. Do they warrant the conclusion that the issue of the Second Front may now be regarded as decided as a result of the Moscow Conference, and that the campaign for the speediest opening of the Second Front may now be regarded as unnecessary? On the contrary. The aim of the Second Front in Western Europe is agreed in principle. This was already proclaimed by the Prime Minister in his speech in Parliament in September, and in General Smut's speech. Preparations for the Second Front are in hand. The Second Front is on the way, is drawing nearer, is "not far off." But how near? In one month? In three months? In six months? Or later? *The question is not whether the Second Front will be opened, but when?* That is the crucial question on which the future depends. Are the preparations in hand being hastened to coincide with the present Soviet offensive? Or are the old time-tables dragging on (with even the possibility of new delays through the retardation of the advance in Italy or the setbacks in the Dodecanese? Here there is no room for optimistic assumptions or credulous illusions. Hull's statement implies that the old time-tables, the old decisions which "had already been adopted" still hold, but "may be improved." It is for the mass campaign to see that they are "improved."

The answer to this crucial question depends, above all, on the strength of the popular campaign in this country. Only the most intensive democratic campaign for the speeding up

of the Second Front can defeat the powerful political reactionary forces which are obstructing it, and which can no longer even attempt to conceal their political opposition behind technical arguments. We cannot afford to forget that the far more explicit pledge of the early summer of 1942, recognising the urgency of the establishment of the Second Front in Europe in 1942, was overridden and still remains unfulfilled. So far as the technical factors are concerned, the report of the United States Senate Sub-Committee on War Mobilisation in October revealed, on official expert authority, that it would be possible "to deliver a decisive blow to Europe this year" and establish a Second Front in Europe with 160 divisions before Christmas. The crucial question is the political question.

In this connection it is important to recognise that authoritative American press expression, as of the *New York Times*, has now stated that expert military authority has declared for the immediate opening of the Second Front, and that the opposition is, as they claim, a British *political* opposition. The military correspondent of the *New York Times*, Hanson Baldwin, has affirmed that American military opinion "has long agreed with the Russian contention that a cross-channel invasion is the best way to victory":—

Most American military thought seems to agree that the Channel invasion is the quickest and surest way to win the war in Europe. But the British have not agreed with this theory.... Political factors and post-war nationalistic aspirations complicate the judgment of military strategy. —(*New York Times*, September 19, 1943).

This indicates how important it is to strengthen the campaign in this country.

It is of parallel importance to fight for the fulfilment of the political decisions of the Three-Power Conference. The second main field of decisions of the Conference laid down the lines of the necessary political steps to ensure the victory of democracy and the destruction of Fascism. The broad principles of the Atlantic Charter are here brought down to earth and given flesh and blood in daily practice. For the first time in any official document of the United Nations the aim of the "utter destruction of Fascism and all its evil influence and emanations" is definitely laid down and agreed. The Declaration on Italy has a significance reaching far beyond Italy. Not

only is the principle laid down, but precise and concrete measures are fixed for its fulfilment. The "utter destruction" of Fascism means the "suppression" of "all institutions and organisations created by the Fascist regime" (not only the Fascist Party). It means the "removal" of "all Fascist or pro-Fascist elements" from "administration and from institutions and organisations of a public character." The Fascist war criminals are to be "brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged." These decisions place powerful levers in the hands of the peoples for the extermination of Fascism. No less precise are the indications for democratic anti-Fascist development even during military operations: the release of anti-Fascist prisoners; freedom of speech, assembly and organisation; democratic organs of local government; and drawing of representatives with consistent anti-Fascist records into the Government.

But the effectiveness of these decisions requires the activity of the democratic movement in this country to ensure their fulfilment. We cannot be satisfied that the preliminary declaration of the Commander-in-Chief in Italy, with regard to the functions of the Allied Control Commission and the continuance of the machinery of Amgot under the revised short title of A.M.G., or the reorganisation by Badoglio of his Government on a "technical" basis without the participation of the anti-Fascist representatives, yet come anywhere near the fulfilment of the decisions of the Moscow Conference. The Declaration on the independence of Austria closes the door, not only on Pan-German aims of Greater Germany, but equally on other reactionary schemes for the restoration of Austria-Hungary or other reactionary blocs or federations in Central and Eastern Europe; but these schemes are still being peddled around. The Italian Advisory Commission has not yet met. The European Advisory Commission has not yet met. There is still plenty of need for pressure. Nor can we forget our special responsibility in this country to insist that, if the British Government has agreed to these principles of democratic anti-Fascist liberation (release of anti-fascist prisoners; freedom of speech, press and assembly; constitution of a National Government based on democratic anti-Fascist representatives) for enemy occupied territory in Italy, these principles should apply with all the more force in India.

In glaring contrast to the decisions of the Three-Power

Conference is the action of the Government in releasing Sir Oswald Mosley—the “English gentleman conscious of the call of Germanic blood,” in the words of the Nazi radio hailing and applauding Mr. Morrison’s action. This is a political act of major significance, not only for Britain, but for the whole war front, and has been immediately taken as such by Hitler. Mussolini, Laval and every Quisling. The transparent alibi of “medical” grounds, on the basis of a many-years-old complaint, requiring rest, not motion, would not deceive an infant. Was Gandhi released when he was at death’s door? Did they release the wounded and dying Connolly? They tied him to a chair to shoot him. Did Beckett suffer from phlebitis? Did Admiral Sir Barry Domville suffer from weak legs? Was Captain Canning a martyr to piles? The steady succession of releases of leading Fascists and pro-Fascists, whom even Sir John Anderson interned, and whom Mr. Herbert Morrison has set free, has proceeded in a continuous progression over many months from the lesser figures to the big shots, and finally to the head of the Fascist conspiracy, the close associate of Hitler and Mussolini. The release of all these is in fact a political decision. And it must be remembered that Fascism still represents the reserve weapon of reaction in this country in preparation for after the war—unless the people take the opportunity now to smash and destroy the beast, and compel the Government to act.

The release of Hitler in 1924 from his luxurious detention—under the same pleas that Hitler was “no longer important,” “not a danger”—has cost millions of lives for Germany and the world. Would it not have been better for the world if Hitler had been shot in 1924—as the Soviet Union showed how to deal with the Fifth Column in its trials, which have been worth many military victories for the United Nations. But even that release was in peacetime. This release is in the midst of war against Fascism, immediately after a sacred pledge by the Government to deal with “Fascists and pro-Fascists” without mercy. This is an outrage. Why should the ignominious path of the Weimar Republic be slavishly followed in this country? Is it conceivable that after the accursed example of German Social Democracy right up to the end of 1932 and even the beginning of 1933 pooh-poohing the Communist warnings and appeals and declaring that Hitler was no danger, now on November 19, 1943, the *Daily Herald* can placidly declare once more that British Fascism “is no

danger and will never rise again.' Have Mr. Herbert Morrison and Miss Ellen Wilkinson no higher ambition than to imitate faithfully the feeblest and most despised figures of political history, the Social Democratic Ministers of the Weimar Republic—fierce only against working-class unity, and tolerant to home-grown Fascists? The entire Government is on trial before the nation on this issue. It is for the War Cabinet to understand the seriousness of the feeling roused. The formidable storm of protest aroused by this action is testimony of the health of public opinion, which is well in advance of the Government Ministers who seek to lecture it, as well as of the press, and has made this a test issue for the seriousness of the Government's fight against Fascism and the fulfilment of the Three-Power Conference decisions.

Finally, the most far-reaching long-term decisions of the Three-Power Conference turn on the organisation of world-peace and international collaboration after the war. The decisions here reached have the most important bearing on present policy and the future perspective. As the prospect of victory draws closer, so the questions of future world organisation and the maintenance of peace loom large. Fears for the future and gloomy prophecies of "World War No. 3" are already widely expressed. Memories of the sequel to the last war; the promises of world organisation and peace through collective security; the formation of the League of Nations and its collapse in the face of Fascist aggression, and the consequent transition to the second world war, deeply colour present thought. It is therefore especially important to make understood the significance of the decisions now reached, and the new perspective which they hold out, placing within our grasp a very different line of development from that which characterised the years from the first to the second world war.

Is it possible to organise international collaboration and the maintenance of peace in the world after the war, and after the defeat of Fascism, and to prevent renewed world war, in the face of the very great differences of social and political systems between the different countries of the United Nations, and the inevitable conflicts of imperialist interests? The achievement of this aim depends on carrying forward the collaboration of the United Nations, under the leadership of the principal Powers of the alliance, in the tasks of reconstruction and in the world after the war. Socialists are well aware

that there can be no automatic guarantee of peace in the existing unstable social order over the world, that is, while capitalism survives. But it is of paramount urgency that the democratic peoples of the world should unite their efforts to hold war in check, pending the advance to a more harmonious social order, that is, to world socialism, which can alone finally eliminate the causes of war. The accomplishment of this task, which is expressed in the conception of collective security, depends, not primarily on legal forms or paper constitutions, but on the united will and action of the peoples of the world, and decisively of the leading democratic peoples, representing the main centres of world-power. The existence of the alliance of the United Nations, and the complete destruction of Fascism, for the first time establishes the conditions for the accomplishment of this task.

Why did the League of Nations fail? The League of Nations failed, not because it attempted to organise collective security, but because it was not such "a general international organisation" contemplated in the Four-Power Declaration, and did not include the leading World Powers. At the outset it excluded the Soviet Union and failed to win the adherence of the United States, thus failing to include the two largest World Powers. Hence it was at the outset a sectional organisation, a limited instrument of Anglo-French domination in Europe and an anti-Soviet instrument. When in the later years of developing Fascist aggression the attempt was made to use it as an instrument for collective security, and the Soviet Union joined it for that purpose, the reactionary pro-Fascist policy at that time of the two Western European Powers dominating its councils paralysed its action and led to its collapse.

Now for the first time the Four-Power Declaration of Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States and China provides the pledge of collaboration of the four principal World Powers, after the destruction of Fascism, assuming the responsibility of joint leadership in the establishment of a general international organisation of all peace-loving States. For the quarter of a century between the two world wars the deep division between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers, fostered by reaction in the West, constituted the fundamental antagonism of world politics, and on the basis of this antagonism Fascism was enabled to climb to power. The co-operation of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union is the key to world peace. This co-operation has at last been established in the Alliance of

the United Nations. Its continuance after the war is the key to the problems of world politics after the war. The British-Soviet Twenty Years Treaty of Alliance represents the foundation stone for this co-operation. The Four-Power Declaration represents the second great landmark on the road. If we carry forward this line of development, on the basis of the unity and strength of the democratic forces defeating all reactionary attempts to disrupt it, then indeed the way is opened to the organisation of stable peace and security after the war, and to rapid democratic advance in the common tasks of reconstruction and in the building of a new world.

These are the great perspectives which the Moscow Conference decisions hold out. But their realisation depends on our present action. They depend, above all, on present effective military action for the speedy defeat of Fascism. They depend on mobilising all forces for the struggle and defeating every reactionary attempt to save Fascism. Serious warning must be taken from such signs, after the Moscow Conference, as the release of Mosley, or the reconstruction of the Government in a way that, in place of removing the Munichite or anti-Soviet reactionaries, actually tilts the balance further in an unfavourable direction. No less serious warning must be taken from the military situation revealed in Italy and the Dodecanese, with the inevitable consequences, as warned by advocates of the Second Front, of delay of the Second Front and selection of illusory alternatives in preference, and with the future consequence of having made possible, by the withdrawal of divisions from Italy and Western Europe, the renewed Nazi counter-offensive in the East. All these dangerous tendencies in the situation need speedy correction. The primary immediate task now is to hasten by all means in our power the advance to the final combined offensive and the final victorious battle against Fascism, in order to go forward to the further great aims which are indicated in the Moscow Conference decisions, and in order to go forward to the aims of full democratic and social liberation which constitute the goal of the working-class movement.

November 21, 1943.

[From the *Labour Monthly*.]

THE TEHERAN CONFERENCE

THE outlook for 1944 is governed by the Teheran decisions. Teheran has completed Moscow. At last, after two and a half years of the alliance, a united strategy has replaced the previous sectional strategies. The signals are set for the planned and concerted all-out offensive of the United Nations, "from the east, west and south," for the final destruction of Fascism in Europe. This perspective of battle and victory governs 1944. Gigantic tasks of practical fulfilment will follow from these decisions. Gigantic new problems will arise in and through their fulfilment. A firm political line has been set by the Teheran Decisions, following and carrying forward the previous Moscow decisions, for the solution of these problems and for the future of world organisation. We need to be prepared for all the tasks—military and political—which will arise in this final battle for the destruction of Fascism in Europe and for the winning of a secure victory and peace of the peoples. This is the mighty perspective of 1944. The fulfilment of this perspective will make 1944 the year of the opening of a new world historical era.

Teheran crowned 1943. 1943 was a year of great events ; even though it was also a year of a lost opportunity—the lost opportunity of that final victory for which the overwhelming strength of the Soviet offensive and Allied arms already opened the way, but which was delayed by the lack of a united Allied strategy. For the first time 1943 was a year of a continuously advancing offensive of the Allies, with Nazism thrown on the defensive on all fronts. At the opening of the year the Nazi forces still reached to the banks of the Volga, to the Caucasus and to Northern Africa ; Mussolini entered on his twenty-first year of power in Italy ; the European fortress of Nazi domination was unbroken. How great is the transformation which twelve months have wrought !

A year which began with the surrender of the Nazi armies at Stalingrad, the raising of the Leningrad siege and the occupation of Tripoli, saw the advance of the Soviet offensive by

the spring to Rostov and Kursk, to Viasma and Rzhev, and the final clearing of North Africa by May. It saw the complete liquidation of the Nazi summer offensive at Kursk in July, the Anglo-American landing in Sicily in the same month, the collapse of Mussolini by the end of July, and the Italian armistice in the beginning of September, followed by the Anglo-American landing in Italy. It saw the accelerating intensity of Allied air raids on Germany in the second half of the year, and the advance of the Anglo-American armies to Naples and towards Rome. Above all, it saw the mighty sweep of the renewed Soviet offensive which followed the liquidation of the Nazi summer offensive in July; which in four months inflicted 2,700,000 casualties on the German armies, with the destruction or capture of 18,000 tanks and 10,000 planes (making in all, in the twelve months to the beginning of November, a total of four million German casualties, including 1,800,000 dead, and the destruction or capture of 25,000 tanks, 40,000 guns and 14,000 planes); and which by the beginning of November had liberated two-thirds of the Nazi-occupied Soviet territory, sweeping forward to Orel and Byelgorod and Kharkov in August, to Briansk and Smolensk in September, to the crossing of the Dnieper in October and the battles of the Dnieper bend, the liberation of Kiev in November and advance west of Kiev, and culminating in the gigantic battles of the supreme Nazi counter-offensive west of Kiev in the closing weeks of the year and the new Soviet offensive on the Neval sector.

In all these tremendous achievements what was still lacking for final victory? The main weakness was still the lack of a unified Allied strategy, to strike Germany from the West and from the East at once, and the absence of a concerted and consistent anti-Fascist political strategy capable of utilising the rising tide of anti-Fascist popular revolt in all the countries of Europe in response to the changing military situation. The Second Front in the West was still resisted and delayed (and even the popular demand for it denounced in ill-advised quarters as ignorant clamour) in favour of a long-term gradualist strategy which held the main forces inactive and prevented any comparable parallel blow synchronising with the opportunity afforded by the mighty Soviet offensive. In consequence once again in 1943 Nazi divisions could be transferred from the West (and in the supreme Kiev counter-offensive even from Italy) to the East; and the 179 Nazi divisions on the Eastern Front in 1942 became 207 Nazi divisions in 1943, or, including

the satellite forces, the total of 240 Axis divisions on the Eastern Front in 1942 became 257 in 1943.

Similarly in the political field the incomplete consolidation of the alliance gave new opportunities to Nazism to survive and intrigue, despite its increasing marked inferiority of forces. During the first two-thirds of the year the separate Anglo-American Conferences at Casablanca in January, at Washington in May and at Quebec in August, while fulfilling their function in their special sphere, revealed the separation alike of military and political planning. The errors of Darlanism in North Africa in the beginning of the year only slowly gave place, under the relentless pressure of political realities, to the tardy and still incomplete recognition of the French National Committee as the representative of France. The signal opportunity presented by the surging advance of the Italian National Anti-Fascist front in the summer, whose mass pressure played its powerful part in bringing about the fall of Mussolini and in compelling the armistice, was thrown away in favour of the strangling machinery of Amgot, with its maintenance of Fascist institutions and prohibition of anti-Fascist politics. The outstanding success of the formation of the Free Germany National Committee in July, on the basis of the main body of Germans outside Germany, the German prisoners in the Soviet Union, met with no corresponding endeavour, but only a negative reception, from official quarters in the West. Support of the traitor Mihailovitch only slowly gave place to recognition of the decisive role of the Yugoslav Liberation Front, which was able to engage more Axis divisions than the Anglo-American forces were engaging; Polish disruptive reactionaries, playing in concert with Goebbels' Katyn propaganda, were left free to make a breach in the diplomatic front of the United Nations; while barriers were maintained against the signing of the Soviet-Czechoslovak Pact. Thus in spite of, and ever, because of, the increasing military successes, the experience of 1943 demonstrated with sharpening urgency the critical necessity of a closer consolidation of the alliance, and especially of a closer concerted understanding of the three main partners, Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States, alike in the military and in the political sphere, as the condition of victory over Fascism.

In this urgent situation the Three-Power Conferences and Agreements of Moscow and Teheran in the closing quarter of the year have constituted the turning-point of the alliance and

the highest level of realisation yet achieved of the world front against Fascism. Their outcome transforms every factor of the war situation and of the world political situation. For the first time the Governments of the three leading Powers, whose partnership is decisive equally for the war and for the peace, have met in close consultation and common planning, and reached definite concords for present action and future settlement. The Moscow Three-Power Agreements and Four-Power Declaration of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin on December 1, constitute a new development whose significance for the whole future of world history will only be more generally understood as their consequences unfold themselves. They have laid the sure foundations for the final defeat of Fascism. These Agreements, corresponding to world-realities, and won by the prowess and proven strength of anti-Fascist arms, reflect new relations of power in the world—the beginning of the shifting of power on a world scale from the hands of reaction to the hands of the peoples.

Undoubtedly the primary immediate significance of the Teheran Declaration lies in the military decisions. On the fulfilment of these military decisions all else depends. When Teheran could announce that Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin had reached "complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operation which will be undertaken from the east, south and west," this announcement meant that at last, after two-and-a-half years, the long fight for the Second Front had been crowned with success. When Mr. Eden reported that "close co-ordination of all our military plans was reached at the Conference," he added the significant words: "We have not had this until now." With these words he uttered a crushing answer to all those critics who had sought to denounce the Communist campaign for a unified allied strategy and the Second Front as ill-informed and superfluous, on the grounds that everything was supposed to be already in order and agreement was supposed to be already existing between the higher authorities. It is these wiseacre critics who are now officially declared to have been wrong, and the Communists who are officially declared to have been right. Mr. Eden added the further significant words: "As a result the war will be shortened." Indeed, the whole outcome of Moscow and Teheran is a very powerful vindication of all the aims and objectives for which the consistent opponents of Fascism have tenaciously fought. Thereby it is a very present encouragement for fur-

ther endeavours, with mounting confidence for all democrats and working-class fighters in the future.

But the present moment requires looking forwards, not backwards. We can afford no illusions as to the magnitude and seriousness of the battles to which the people of this country now stand committed. Up to the present, for the first four years, there has been relatively limited experience of serious war for this country, still less for the United States—compared to what the populations of the occupied countries have gone through, or compared to the scale of modern mechanised warfare revealed on the Eastern Front. It would be folly to assume that the war can be ended with continued corresponding immunity, by the sacrifices of others, or by the automatic collapse of the enemy, or to underestimate the last desperate thrusts of the cornered Fascist beast. Every effort needs to be directed, now more than ever, to intensified war production, to overcoming obstacles or weaknesses in the home situation, and to strengthening national unity and anti-Fascist determination.

It is necessary to fight for the fulfilment of the Moscow and Teheran decisions. We should not under-estimate the activity of those forces which are basically hostile to the spirit of Moscow and Teheran, even behind the chorus of formal approval in official press and parliamentary expression, and which will seek to impede the fulfilment of the decisions. Once again the Stock Exchange slumped after Teheran, as it slumped after Moscow. Such an article as that of "Scrutator" in the *Sunday Times* of December 19 reveals how the old opponents of the Second Front and advocates of delay have not abandoned their propaganda merely because the official verdict has gone against them. The coal situation and many other features in industry show how serious a fight needs to be waged for necessary measures against the opposition of vested interests. The Mosley release, following immediately after the Moscow decisions, in direct contravention of their spirit and letter, gives warning how the Fifth Column strives to deliver its counter-thrust to meet each new advance of democracy. Hence this is no time for premature assumptions of victory already won, merely because the indispensable decisions for victory have at last been taken. In the words of the Prime Minister, on the eve of leaving for Teheran:

"We must not lose for a moment the sense and cons-

ciousness of urgency and crisis which must continue to drive us."

Once this primary military task is placed in the forefront, it is possible and necessary also to emphasise the significance of the political decisions of Teheran. The political decisions of Moscow had already set out the main tasks and basis of agreement for the victory of Democracy over Fascism, for the "utter destruction of Fascism and all its evil influence and emanations," for the punishment of war criminals (with the first signal demonstration in practice through the Kharkov trial, whose revelations should steel and harden the anti-Fascist determination of every man and woman), for the freedom and sovereign independence of the European nations enslaved by Fascism, and for the future of world organisation to preserve peace. Teheran carried forward Moscow, not only by the declaration that the three decisive World Powers, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United State, "shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow," but by the further delineation of the character of the world organisation to follow the war.

In the Four-Power Declaration of Moscow the pledge was given to establish:—

A general international organisation, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States and open to membership by all such States, large or small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Teheran carried this further by declaring:—

We shall seek the co-operation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world family of democratic nations.

Here the new principle is introduced of "the world family of democratic nations": that the basis of the nations composing the world organisation of the nations for the maintenance of peace must be democracy, corresponding to the democratic institutions of the Founder Powers, whether of Britain, the United States or the Soviet Union. The British, American and Soviet peoples pledge their dedication to "the elimination of

tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance," and invite all nations dedicated to the same aims to join "the world family of democratic nations." These are large aims, and carry far-reaching corresponding obligations.

Nor is it unworthy of incidental note that, by this official recognition of the common democratic principles inspiring the British, American and Soviet peoples, the old foul slanders of reaction which sought to deny Soviet Democracy, or to equate Fascism and Communism and counterpose them to "Democracy," are here given, as it were, decent official burial. These old senseless slanders served only the interests of Fascism and reaction by striving to erect a wall of separation between the democratic peoples of the West and the freest democracy of the world. Henceforth the scribes of Transport House and the *Daily Mail*, if they cannot mend their manners and adapt themselves to the new conditions, will have to be pensioned off, whose main delight was to dilate on "Stalinist tyranny" and "Communist slavery," and who will learn with horror from the Teheran Agreement that they are required, not only to place these choice morsels of political wisdom in cold storage for the duration, as they have already done, but to regard them as equally barred for the post-war world. "Iago's occupation's gone."

Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States recognise "the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations."

"Will it be so again—

The jungle code and the hypocrite gesture?

A poppy wreath for the slain

And a cut-throat world for the living?

That stale imposture

Played on us once again?

Will it be as before—

Peace with no heart or mind to ensue it,

Guttering down to war

Like a libertine to his grave?"

The poet of 1943 asks the question and essays no answer. Moscow and Teheran have given the beginning of an answer, which can be made good by the peoples.

It is inevitable that, as the prospect of victory over Fascism draws closer, speculations over the post-war world should

increase. Not all these speculations are progressive. Not all the enemies of democracy are as open as a Mosley. Many of these speculations ill-conceal hostility to the spirit of the Moscow and Teheran Agreements, and alarm and counter-planning in face of the advance of the liberation of the peoples and the growing strength of the Socialist State. Behind formal acceptance of the aims of the United Nations, in the guise of "realism," reactionary plans of one type or another—here of Anglo-Americanism as separate from the alliance with the Soviet Union, there of "European unity" to strangle national independence and carry forward the framework of the Nazi Pan-German "New Order"—are trundled out to cut across the clear lines of the anti-Fascist fight. An example of these tendencies to harmful speculation may be found in the recent speech of General Smuts to the Empire Parliamentary Association at the very moment of the Teheran Conference, which has been published under the title *Thoughts on the New World* and given wide publicity.

General Smuts is a peculiar institution of the British Constitution—a kind of additional Upper House to lecture democracy. From time to time his speeches are given resounding publicity as the profound meditations of an Elder Statesman. The somewhat tainted exhalations of this upholder of the colour-bar despotism of South Africa—where, on the basis of two million enfranchised Whites, the Rand lords of gold and diamonds hold eight million Africans in the lowest subjection, squalor and poverty—find high favour in the nostrils of certain sections of the ruling class in this country, and are eagerly spread as pearls of democratic wisdom in the hope of confusing and corrupting healthy democratic opinion in this country. But this time "slim Jan" has overreached himself. His contemptuous dismissal of French Democracy ("France has gone, and will be gone in our day and perhaps for many a day"), and servile adulation of "the great German people" ("the Germans are a great people, with great qualities, and Germany is inherently a great country") have aroused universal and justified indignation. This passage, however, was only one in which the cloven hoof was too grossly revealed, and has in consequence for the first time awakened general opinion to be on guard against this purveyor of idealist sophistications of the slaveholding mentality. In fact, the line of the whole speech deserves analysis as a warning of how not to speculate about the post-war world.

The keynote of General Smuts' speech was set in his opening. He began with some innocent-seeming generalities to caution his hearers against two dangers in approaching the present world-situation: "over-simplification" or "catchwords and slogans." Such advice might seem harmless platitude. But the examples revealed the real purpose. The danger of "over-simplification" was illustrated in relation to "the problem of race and colour, which is a root problem in our Empire"; he insisted there could be "no simple standardised solution" and warned against "well-meaning people" who "think you can by short cuts arrive at a solution." In other words: Hands off the colour-bar tyranny in South Africa; beware of the Wendell Willkies who speak of "One World" and have attacked the theories of racial superiority and racial discrimination in the British Empire and the United States; beware of "simple standardised solutions" such as the freedom and equality of nations and races or "the abolition of racial intolerance," as are realised in the Soviet Constitution. Under cover of an innocent warning against "over-simplification" the racial theory is implanted at the outset.

No less revealing is the example of "catchwords and slogans." The example of misleading "catchwords and slogans" against which it is found necessary to warn his hearers is—Democracy!

To-day we hear a great deal of democracy. We are fighting the battle of democracy. We are fighting for freedom. Of course we do. But these words become clichés, they become catchwords and vague slogans which in the end do not lead you very far.

Inspiring words for the underground fighters of Europe. The Axis, it appears, i.e., Fascism (politely described as "our opponents") has a parallel and comparable set of "catchwords and slogans"—leadership or "the Fuehrer principle":—

Our opponents have another set of formulas. They fight for the leadership principle, the Fuehrer principle. With them the objective has also become a catchword, a cliché.

Thus the United Nations fight for Democracy. The Axis fights for Fascism. From the superior heights of this philosopher both aims are mere clichés. What is the "practical

solution"? To combine the best of both :—

You will only get to practical solutions in the end if you have a good mixture of both democracy and freedom on the one hand, and of a leadership on the other.

Once again a seemingly harmless platitude, if this sentence were taken in isolation. But *in the context* the meaning becomes rather different. For the two principles have been described as the rival principles of the United Nations and the Axis, of Democracy and Fascism. And the "practical solution" is to achieve "a good mixture of both." A "practical solution" which might have been thought more suggestive of the spirit of a Chamberlain than of the spirit of the Moscow Agreement. Thus, under cover of a warning against "catchwords" the second principle is smuggled in— the warning with regard to Democracy.

Armed with these principles, the aged philosopher surveys the post-war world. He sees three main World Powers after the war—the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain. This is indisputable, even though this "over-simplification" may too easily brush aside as negligible the role of other nations, both great and small. Rejecting the proposals for separate Anglo-American combination, he supports the co-operation of these three Powers after the war as the indispensable basis of world-peace. This is equally indisputable, and fully in accord with the aims of the United Nations and of the Teheran Declaration. This fundamentally correct position saves the speech from being as a whole or basically reactionary; it is only the accompanying tendencies that are dangerous and misleading and that have caused the justified controversy.

For General Smuts sees the partnership and leading role of the three World Powers in very different terms from the spirit of the Teheran Declaration, with its affirmation of that partnership in terms of "friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose" and its invitation to "all nations, large and small" to enter into "the world family of democratic nations" on the basis of the aim of "the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance." He sees the partnership as a Power combination in terms of mutual suspicion. He fears the size of the United States and the Soviet Union relative to Britain, and finds it "an unequal partnership." He sees in the Soviet Union, not the mighty ally of national liberation, whose strength has saved the world from Fascist conquest, but the

"Russian Colossus," "the new Colossus that bestrides the Continent." He sees the most inspiring chapter of human history, the glorious advance and achievement of the new socialist civilisation during the past quarter of a century, as "Russia's *inexplicable* and phenomenal rise." The word is revealing. The advancing strength of the Soviet Union during the past quarter of a century could only be "inexplicable" to one who was really ignorant of the strength of Socialism; who really believed the wishful-thinking propaganda about the bankruptcy and inefficiency of the Soviet Union and the incompetence of the Red Army; in other words, who was politically illiterate in terms of the real forces of the modern world.

Hence his proposal to correct the balance and strengthen Britain by calling in the lesser nations of Europe to enjoy the high honour of entering the British Empire with Dominion status. "Surely they must feel that their place is with this member of the trinity." Thus it would be possible to "create out of closer union with Great Britain a great European State." The proposal might seem to be so fantastic and unrealist as to be laughable, and comparable only to the similar *gaucherie* of the offer of incorporation to France in 1940, the very rumour of which helped to bring down the unfortunate Reynaud and played into the hands of the traitor Petain. But it is necessary to recognise that this conception is seriously entertained by certain ruling sections with hopes of support from corresponding upper sections in the European countries, such as have supported Hitler's "New Order" against their own peoples in the name of "European Unity." It is also supported by certain deluded and confused "left" elements and social democratic elements, who, carried away by the conception of the "obsolete" character of "nationality" and "national sovereignty," and acclaiming the superior advantages of "larger units" and the ideal of the "Unity of Europe," play into the hands of the enemies of popular freedom.

It is therefore essential to speak plainly—as the representatives of Free France have already spoken plainly—of this type of propaganda, which is an insult to the real forces of the new Europe, and a gift to Hitler (as it has already been abundantly used on the Axis radio). Such proposals could only be made in an ignorance of national feeling and of the popular forces in Europe, not less deep than the previous ignorance of the rise of the Soviet Union. When France has risen

anew from its present oppression, no doubt the sapient General Smuts will also find this rebirth "inexplicable." If General Smuts thinks fit to prophesy that "France has gone, and will be gone in our day, and perhaps for many a day," it is justifiable to point out to him that there is considerably less uncertainty about the future rebirth and greatness of France than there is about the future prospects of that unstable colour-bar minority dictatorship which goes at present by the name of the Union of South Africa.

The peoples of Europe are fighting for their national liberation. No power on earth will rob them of their aim, neither Hitler, nor any other. It is the reaction, the corrupt upper-class and conservative elements, who have branded themselves for ever as traitors and pro-Boches by embracing national slavery in the hope to maintain their privileges, and who seek to cover up their treason by prating of the superior advantages of the economic and political unification of Europe.*

The hour of retribution is drawing near for these elements, and the mass popular forces who have fought through these years of hell for freedom will not let them escape. The cause of national freedom, of national independence and sovereignty, is bound up with the cause of Democracy. Only when the peoples enslaved by Fascism have won their freedom, have won their full national independence and sovereignty, and chosen their own forms of government and social and political institutions, only then will the time come for them to consider freely such further forms of local or regional co-operation and association as they may desire. This is the meaning of the Declaration on Austria. This is the line of the Moscow and Teheran agreements. And for these aims, as for all the aims of the Moscow and Teheran agreements, we will fight against every plan and manoeuvre of reaction.

Britain has a great and pivotal role to play in the post-war world. The friendship of the British and Soviet peoples, enshrined in the Twenty Year British-Soviet Treaty of Alliance ;

*M. Tixier (French National Committee) addressing the governing body of the International Labour Office in London yesterday, said that there was no organised resistance to the Nazis among employers' organisations in France, but there was individual resistance among the small and medium-sized employers. No representatives of large employers had been imprisoned.

(Sunday Times, December 19, 1943.)

the close ties and association of the British and American peoples ; the links of Britain with the peoples of Europe and with overseas : all these give to Britain a pivotal role in building and cementing the firm co-operation of the three principal World Powers and of all the nations of the world on the lines of the Teheran Declaration. There is no need to fear "an unequal partnership," provided that role is seized and fulfilled. There is no need to fear a dismal perspective for Britain as "a poor country," (the millionaires who make these prophecies have no intention of being poor themselves, but only of keeping the people poor in order to maintain their own wealth and profits). There is a great, progressive and prosperous future for Britain—provided that the British people rise to the heights of the opportunities of the new world of co-operation of the peoples opened out by the Teheran Agreement.

But to fulfil this role, the British people must stand firmly on the basis of democratic advance ; in the forefront of the fight for the achievement of the democratic and progressive aspirations of the peoples of the world ; for "the elimination of tyranny and slavery, of oppression and intolerance." This requires bold new departures and advances in policy, at home no less than abroad. It requires the liberation of India ; it requires the replacement of colonial domination by relations of voluntary co-operation (in the colonial sphere, even more than in the European sphere, the Smuts proposals, under cover of "decentralisations," are markedly reactionary ; but space prevents their adequate treatment here). It requires also the decisive defeat of the reactionary Fifth Column and pro-Fascist elements within Britain, and of the monopolist interests which strangle the country. It is essential to clear the way for the democratic and social advance which is long overdue, and for which all the material, technical and political consequences of the war have strengthened the conditions. Victory over Fascism is only the first stage to the final aim of full political, social and economic liberation in Britain.

We fight for these aims. It is for the sake of these aims that we call for the supreme endeavour to win speedy victory. Therefore we urge that all forces should now be concentrated towards the battle in front ; that the fulfilment of the plans agreed at Teheran is now the dominant and all-embracing practical task ; and that towards this objective we need now to direct all our efforts ; to tackle the problems of production, coal, transport and the home front ; to strengthen national unity

and democratic initiative ; and to strengthen the composition of the Government so that it shall be able to carry out most effectively the plans agreed at Teheran and correspond in its whole spirit and character to the democratic anti-Fascist outlook of the Moscow and Teheran Agreements.

The battle rises higher as it approaches its climax. The first trial of the war criminals at Kharkov has laid bare to the whole world the face of the enemy. The sentences on the war criminals at Kharkov, executed before thousands who have fought and suffered, will speed joy and hope through all the oppressed peoples of Europe and that the hour of retribution is at hand, that Fascism will not escape its doom, that the night of Fascism is drawing to a close at the hands of the armies of the United Nations, and that the stern justice of the people will cleanse the earth to clear the way for the co-operation of the nations on the path of freedom. Let us unite and strengthen our efforts to speed the day. The fulfilment of the Moscow and Teheran Agreements in 1944 will open a new era for humanity.

December 20, 1943.

[From the *Labour Monthly*.]

APPENDICES

THE ANGLO-SOVIET AGREEMENT, 1942

HIS MAJESTY The King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ;

Desiring to confirm the stipulations of the Agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for joint action in the war against Germany, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941, and to replace them by a formal treaty;

Desiring to contribute after the war to the maintenance of peace and to the prevention of further aggression by Germany or the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe ;

Desiring, moreover, to give expression to their intention to collaborate closely with one another as well as with the other United Nations at the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on the basis of the principles enunciated in the declaration made on the 14th August, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain to which the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has adhered ;

Desiring, finally, to provide for mutual assistance in the event of an attack upon either High Contracting Party by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe ;

Have decided to conclude a treaty for that purpose and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries :—

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India,

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ;

The Right Honourable Anthony Eden, M.P. His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs ;

The Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ;

M. Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,

Who, having communicated their Full Powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:—

PART I

ARTICLE I

In virtue of the alliance established between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the High Contracting Parties mutually undertake to afford one another military and other assistance and support of all kinds in the war against Germany and all those States which are associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

ARTICLE II

The High Contracting Parties undertake not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions, and not to negotiate or conclude except by mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

PART II

ARTICLE III

(1) The High Contracting Parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period.

(2) Pending the adoption of such proposals, they will after the termination of hostilities take all the measures in their power to render impossible a repetition of aggression and violation of the peace by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

ARTICLE IV

Should one of the High Contracting Parties during the post-war period become involved in hostilities with Germany or

any of the States mentioned in Article III (2) in consequence of an attack by that State against that Party, the other High Contracting Party will at once give to the Contracting Party so involved in hostilities all the military and other support and assistance in his power.

This Article shall remain in force until the High Contracting Parties, by mutual agreement, shall recognise that it is superseded by the adoption of the proposals contemplated in Article III (1). In default of the adoption of such proposals, it shall remain in force for a period of twenty years, and thereafter until terminated by either High Contracting Party, as provided in Article VIII.

ARTICLE V

The High Contracting Parties, having regard to the interests of the security of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the re-establishment of peace for the organisation of security and economic prosperity in Europe. They will take into account the interests of the United Nations in these objects, and they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandisement for themselves and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

ARTICLE VI

The High Contracting Parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

ARTICLE VII

Each High Contracting Party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take any part in any coalition directed against the other High Contracting Party.

ARTICLE VIII

The present Treaty is subject to ratification in the shortest possible time and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Moscow as soon as possible.

It comes into force immediately on the exchange of the instruments of ratification and shall thereupon replace the Agreement between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty's Government in the United

Kingdom, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941.

Part I of the present Treaty shall remain in force for a period of twenty years. Thereafter, unless twelve months' notice has been given by either Party to terminate the Treaty at the end of the said period of twenty years, it shall continue in force until twelve months after either High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the other in writing of his intention to terminate it.

In witness whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate in London on the 26th day of May, 1942, in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

ANTHONY EDEN.

V. MOLOTOV.

London, May 26, 1942.

A statement issued by the Foreign Office on June 11 said:—

The two Governments are confident that this treaty will form a solid basis for future good relations between their countries and will further strengthen the already close and cordial understanding existing between the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, as well as between them and the United States of America, which were kept informed of the course of the conversations and of the signature of the treaty. Both parties are also confident that the treaty will be a new powerful weapon in the struggle against Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe until complete victory is won, and that it will ensure close collaboration between both countries after the victorious end of the war.

Full understanding was reached between the two parties with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942. Mr. Molotov, Mr. Maisky, Major-General Issayev and Rear-Admiral Kharlamov, and Mr. Churchill, Mr. Attlee, Mr. Eden and the British Chiefs of Staff took part in the conversations on this subject. Discussions also took place on the question of further improving the supplies of aeroplanes, tanks and other war material to be sent from Great Britain to the Soviet Union. Both sides were gratified to note the identity of their views on all the above questions.

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Communique

THE CONFERENCE of Foreign Secretaries of the U.S.A., Mr. Cordell Hull, of the United Kingdom, Mr. Anthony Eden, and of the Soviet Union, M. V. M. Molotov, took place at Moscow from October 19 to 30, 1943. There were 12 meetings.

In addition to the Foreign Secretaries, the following took part in the Conference :—

FOR THE U.S.A.:

Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador of the United States.
Major-General John R. Deane, United States Army.
Mr. Green H. Hackworth.
Mr. James C. Dunn, and experts.

FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM :

Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, Ambassador.
Mr. William Strang.
Lieutenant-General Sir Hastings Ismay, and experts.

FOR THE SOVIET UNION :

Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Marshal of the Soviet Union.
M. A. Y. Vyshinsky.
M. M. M. Litvinov, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.
M. V. A. Sergeyev, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Trade.
Major-General A. A. Gryzlov, of the General Staff.
M. G. F. Saksin, Senior Official for the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, and experts.

The agenda included all questions submitted for discussion by the three governments. Some of the questions called for final decisions, and these were taken. On other questions, after discussion, decisions of principle were taken. These questions were referred for detailed consideration to Commissions specially set up for the purpose, or reserved for treatment

through diplomatic channels. Other questions, again, were disposed of by an exchange of views.

The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have been in close co-operation in all matters concerning the common war effort. But this is the first time that the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments have been able to meet together in conference.

In the first place, there were frank and exhaustive discussions on the measures to be taken to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe. Advantage was taken of the presence of Military Advisers representing the respective Chiefs of Staff, in order to discuss definite military operations with regard to which decisions had been taken and which are already being prepared in order to create a basis for the closest military co-operation in the future between the three countries.

Second only to the importance of hastening the end of the war was the recognition by the three Governments that it was essential in their own national interests and in the interests of all peace-loving nations to continue the present close collaboration and co-operation in the conduct of the war into the period following the end of hostilities, and that only in this way could peace be maintained and the political, economic and social welfare of their peoples fully promoted.

This conviction is expressed in a declaration in which the Chinese Government joined during the Conference, and which was signed by the three Foreign Secretaries and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow on behalf of their Governments. This declaration published to-day provides for even closer collaboration in the prosecution of the war and in all matters pertaining to the surrender and disarmament of the enemies with which the four countries are respectively at war. It sets forth the principles upon which the four Governments agree that a broad system of international co-operation and security should be based. Provision is made for the inclusion of all other peace-loving nations great and small, in this system.

The Conference agreed to set up machinery for ensuring the closest co-operation between the three Governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops. For this purpose the Conference decided to establish in London a European Advisory Commission to study these questions and to make joint recommendations to the three Governments.

Provision was made for continuing when necessary the

tripartite consultations of representatives of the three Governments in the respective capitals through the existing diplomatic channels.

The Conference also agreed to establish an Advisory Council for matters relating to Italy, to be composed in the first instance of representatives of their three Governments and of the French Committee of National Liberation. Provision is made for addition to this Council of Representatives of Greece and Yugoslavia in view of their special interests arising out of aggressions of Fascist Italy upon their territory during the present war. This Council will deal with day-to-day questions other than military preparations, and will make recommendations designed to co-ordinate Allied policy with regard to Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries considered it appropriate to re-affirm by a declaration published today the attitude of the Allied Governments in favour of the restoration of democracy in Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries declared it to be the purpose of their Governments to restore the independence of Austria. At the same time they reminded Austria that in the final settlement account will be taken of efforts that Austria may make towards its own liberation. The declaration on Austria is published to-day.

The Foreign Secretaries issued at the Conference a declaration by President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Premier Stalin containing a solemn warning that at the time of granting any armistice to any German Government, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have had any connection with atrocities and executions in countries overrun by German forces, will be taken back to the countries in which their abominable crimes were committed, to be charged and punished according to the laws of those countries.

In an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding which characterised all the work of the Conference, consideration was also given to other important questions. These included not only questions of a current nature but also questions concerning treatment of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, economic co-operation and assurance of general peace.

DECLARATION OF THE FOUR NATIONS ON GENERAL SECURITY

The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R. and China : united in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such Powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender ; conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the people allied to them from the menace of aggression ; recognising the necessity of ensuring rapid and orderly transit from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of this world's human and economic resources for armaments ; jointly declare :—

(1) That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organisation and maintenance of peace and security.

(2) That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

(3) That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed on the enemy.

(4) That they recognise the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organisation, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States and open to membership by all such States, large or small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(5) That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the re-establishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security they will consult with each other, and, as occasion requires, with other members of the United Nations, with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

(6) That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other States except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation ; and

(7) That they will confer and co-operate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

DECLARATION ON ITALY

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom and Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy towards Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that Fascism and all its evil influence and emanations shall be utterly destroyed, and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States and United Kingdom declare that the action of their Governments from the inception of invasion of Italian territory, in so far as paramount military requirements have permitted, has been based upon this policy.

In furtherance of this policy in the future the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect :

(1) It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed Fascism.

(2) Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people, who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.

(3) All institutions and organisations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.

(4) All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from administration and from institutions and organisations of a public character.

(5) All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded a full amnesty.

(6) Democratic organs of local government shall be created.

(7) Fascist chiefs and army generals known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.

In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognise that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles set out above will be determined by the Commander-in-Chief on the basis of instructions received through the combined Chiefs of Staff. The three Governments parties to this declaration will, at the request of any one of them, consult on this matter.

It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people ultimately to choose their own form of government.

DECLARATION ON AUSTRIA

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States have agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Nazi aggression, shall be liberated from German domination.

They regard the annexation imposed upon Austria by Germany's penetration of March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare they wish to see re-established a free and independent Austria, and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves as well as those neighbouring States which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.

Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility which she cannot evade for participation in the war on the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

DECLARATION ON ATROCITIES

The United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union have received from many quarters evidence of atrocities, massacres and cold-blooded mass executions which are being perpetrated by the Hitlerite forces in many of the countries they have overrun and from which they are now being steadily expelled. The brutalities of Hitlerite domination are no new thing, and all people or territories in their grip have suffered from the worst form of government by terror. What is new

is that many of these territories are now being redeemed by the advancing armies of the liberating Powers and that, in their desperation, the recoiling Hitlerite Huns are redoubling their ruthless cruelties. This is now evidenced with particular clearness by the monstrous crimes of the Hitlerites on the territory of the Soviet Union which is being liberated from the Hitlerites, and on French and Italian territory.

Accordingly the aforesaid three Allied Powers, speaking in the interests of the 32 United Nations, hereby solemnly declare and give full warning of their declaration as follows: At the time of the granting of any armistice to any Government which may be set up in Germany, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the Free Governments which will be erected therein. Lists will be compiled in all possible detail from all these countries, having regard especially to the invaded parts of the Soviet Union, to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to Yugoslavia and Greece, including Crete and other islands, to Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France and Italy.

Thus Germans who take part in wholesale shootings of Polish officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian or Norwegian hostages or of Cretan peasants, or who have shared in the slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in the territories of the Soviet Union which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know that they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged. Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied Powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to the accusers in order that justice may be done.

The above declaration is without prejudice to the case of German criminals, whose offences have no particular geographical location and who will be punished by a joint decision of the Governments of the Allies.

DECLARATION OF THE THREE POWERS AT TEHERAN

WE, the President of the U.S.A., the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these four days past in this capital of our Ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.

We expressed our determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow.

As to war, our Military Staffs have joined in our round table discussions and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces.

We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations which will be undertaken from the east, west and south. The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

And as to peace, we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognise fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the co-operation and the active participation of all nations, large and small, whose people in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance.

We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world-family of democratic nations.

No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea and their plants from the air. Our attacks will be relentless and increasing.

From the friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose.

ROOSEVELT, STALIN, CHURCHILL.

1st December,
1943.

CHRONOLOGY

1933

- January 30*—Hitler comes to power as Chancellor of the German Reich.
February 27—Burning of the Reichstag by the Nazis.
March 3—Arrest of Thaelmann, the leader of the Communist Party of Germany.
June—Dollfuss proclaims dictatorship in Austria.
September 21—Trial of Dimitrov begins at Leipzig.
October—Germany withdraws from the League of Nations.
December 23—Acquittal of Dimitrov.

1934

- January 26*—Stalin draws attention to the rise of Fascism and the drive to a new imperialist war at the 17th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)
February 6—United demonstration by Paris workers against the planned Fascist coup.
February 12—Armed resistance by workers of Vienna against Fascist offensive.
February 27—Arrival of Dimitrov in Moscow.
September—U.S.S.R. enters the League of Nations.
October—Armed struggle against Fascism by the Asturian miners in Spain.
December 1—Assassination of Kirov by Trotskyites in Leningrad.

1935

- May 2*—U.S.S.R. signs pact of mutual assistance with France and Czechoslovakia.
June—Peace ballot in England secures 11,000,000 votes.
July 14—United Front demonstration in Paris comprising over half-a-million people.
August 20—Seventh World Congress of the Communist International gives call for international unity against Fascism.

October 3—Mussolini begins invasion of Abyssinia. League of Nations imposes sanctions against Italy.

1936

February 16—Victory of the People's Front in the General Elections in Spain.

March 7—Hitler sends his troops into Rhineland, demilitarised according to Locarno Treaty.

April 12-14—Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress condemns Fascist aggression on China and Abyssinia.

May 3—Victory of the People's Front in the General Elections in France.

May 5—Fall of Addis Ababa. Italian occupation of Abyssinia completes.

June—League of Nations withdraws sanctions against Italy.

July 18—Spanish Fascists rise in arms under General Franco. La Passionaria gives the call: "No Pasaran!" ("They shall not pass!")

August—Germany and Italy aid Spanish rebels. British and French governments sponsor Non-Intervention Committee.

August 19—Trial opens at Moscow of Zinoviev, Kamenev and other conspirators.

October 17—International Brigade formed in Spain.

November 7—Siege of Madrid by rebel forces begins.

November 25—Germany and Japan sign Anti-Comintern Pact.

December 5—The Stalin Constitution passed by the All-Union Congress of Soviets.

December 27-28—The Faizpur session of the Indian National Congress expresses sympathy for the people of Spain and condemns the Anglo-French Non-Intervention policy.

1937

January 23—Trial opens at Moscow of Radek, Piatakov, Sokolnikov and other Trotskyites and conspirators.

February 12—Republican forces in Spain win battle of Jarama.

May 14—Formation of Negrin Government in Spain.

May 31—German warships bombard Spanish port of Almeria.

July 4—London workers demonstrate against Mosley's Black Shirts.

- July 7*—Marco Polo Bridge Incident. Sino-Japanese hostilities begin.
- August 21*—U.S.S.R. signs non-aggression pact with China.
- September 6*—U.S.S.R. lodges protest against piracy by Italian Navy in the Mediterranean.
- September 22*—Resolution of Communist Party of China welcoming united national front against Japanese aggression.
- November 6*—Germany, Italy and Japan sign Anti-Comintern Pact at Rome.
- December 11*—Italy leaves the League of Nations.
- December 12*—First elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. under the Stalin Constitution.

1938

- January*—Continued rise in unemployment figures in Britain.
- February 19-21*—Haripura session of the Indian National Congress reaffirms desire of Indian people to live in peace and friendship with all countries, and, taking note of the fact that British foreign policy is helping Fascism in Germany, Spain and the Far East which is bound to lead to an imperialist war, declares that India cannot be a party to an imperialist war.
- March 2*—Trial opens at Moscow of "the Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites" consisting of Bukharin, Rykov, Yagoda and others.
- March 11*—Hitler occupies Austria.
- April 16*—Anglo-Italian agreement, guaranteeing Italy's rights in the Mediterranean, signed at Rome. Split in British Cabinet.
- July 23*—World Conference for Peace opens at Paris, addressed among others by Jawaharlal Nehru.
- September 30*—Betrayal of Czechoslovakia at Munich.
- October 26*—International Brigade withdrawn from Spain.

1939

- March 15*—Hitler annexes Czechoslovakia.
- March 19*—Chamberlain Government rejects Soviet proposal for conference to discuss peace.
- April 7*—Mussolini seizes Albania.
- April 26*—Germany denounces Anglo-German Naval Agreement and the German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact.

- June 12*—Mr. Strang, subordinate Foreign Office official, sent to Moscow to negotiate.
- August 17*—Breakdown of negotiations, between U.S.S.R., and England and France, following Poland's refusal to allow Red Army on Polish territory to resist Nazi aggression.
- August 23*—Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact.
- September 1*—German troops invade Poland.
- September 3*—Britain and France declare war on Germany.
- September 17*—Liberation of one-half of Poland by the Red Army.
- October 9*—All-India Congress Committee endorses statement of its Working Committee reiterating sympathy with the people of Poland but calling upon the British Government for a statement of war-aims.
- October 22*—Working Committee asks Congress Ministries to resign.
- November 29*—U.S.S.R. breaks off diplomatic relations with Finland. Hostilities begin.
- December 15*—League of Nations expels the U.S.S.R.

1940

- January 24*—Red Star discloses plans of Anglo-French war preparations against the U.S.S.R. in the Near East and of intervention via Finland.
- March 13*—U.S.S.R. signs peace treaty with Finland.
- April 10*—Hitler occupies Denmark, invades Norway.
- April 27*—Allied forces withdraw from Norway.
- May 10*—Churchill takes over premiership from Chamberlain. Hitler invades Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg.
- June 4*—British evacuate four-fifths of their forces from Dunkirk.
- June 10*—Mussolini declares war on England, and France.
- June 17*—Collapse of French Armies.
- June 18*—General de Gaulle exhorts Frenchmen not to give up the fight against the invaders.
- June 22*—Petain signs armistice.
- July 2*—Incorporation of Bessarabia and Bukovina into the U.S.S.R.
- August 5-7*—Lithuania, Esthonia and Latvia join the U.S.S.R.
- August 8*—Hitler starts futile 85-days' air-assault on Britain ("Battle of Britain").

September 24—Japan invades Indo-China.
September 28—Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan.
October 29—Italian troops invade Greece.
November 7—Roosevelt elected President of the U.S.A. for third term.
December 14—U.S.S.R. signs trade pact with China.

1941

January 2—Stalin warns against increased war danger in the *Red Star*.
February 10—U. S. Congress passes Lease and Lend Bill.
March 3—German troops enter Bulgaria.
March 28-31—Pro-Fascist Yugoslav Government replaced by anti-Hitler government. U.S.S.R. recognises new government.
April 6—Hitler invades Yugoslavia and Greece.
April 13—U.S.S.R. signs pact of neutrality with Japan.
April 17—Yugoslav army capitulates.
April 20—Tito issues first proclamation of the Liberation Front in Belgrade, capital of Yugoslavia.
April 30—British evacuate Greece.
May 13—Hess lands in Scotland on "mystery mission."
June 2—British forces evacuate Crete.
June 22—Hitler attacks the U.S.S.R.
July 12—Agreement between governments of Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. for joint action against Hitlerite Germany.
July 30—U.S.S.R. signs agreement with General Sikorski of Poland.
August 14—Proclamation of Atlantic Charter by Churchill and Roosevelt.
August 21—Siege of Leningrad begins.
October 1—Three-Power Conference in Moscow.
November 7—Stalin emphasises the liberationist role of the U.S.S.R. in his November Day speech.
November 25—Anti-Comintern Pact renewed for five years.
December 7—Japan starts war against Britain and the U.S.A. Attack on Pearl Harbour.
December 10—Threat to Moscow beaten off. Opening of first winter offensive by the Red Army.
December 30—Resolution of the Congress Working Committee

at Bardoli, taking note of the change in war-conditions due to the approach of hostilities to the borders of India.

1942

- January 2*—The declaration of 26 nations, including the U.S.S.R., China, America and Britain, at Washington, expressing adherence to the Atlantic Charter.
- February 16*—Singapore surrenders to the Japanese armies.
- February 23*—Stalin declares on Red Army Day: "Hitlér's come and go, but the German people and state will remain."
- March 23*—Cripps arrives at Karachi on political mission.
- April 11*—Cripps' proposals rejected by all Indian national parties.
- May 1*—All-India Congress Committee at Allahabad passes resolution calling on the people for non-violent non-co-operation against the invaders and to work for self-sufficiency and self-protection.
- May 16*—Retreat of Allied forces from Burma completed.
- May 26*—Signing of the 20-years' Anglo-Soviet alliance.
- July 2*—Fall of Sebastopol after prolonged and heroic defence.
- August 9*—Arrest of Gandhiji, Nehru and other Congress leaders.
- September 11*—Battle of Stalingrad begins.
- October 23*—Break-through of the Allied North African armies at El Alamein.
- November 23*—Stalin in his November Day speech draws attention to the division of the world into two camps.
- November 8*—British and American forces land in North Africa.
- November 26*—Anti-fascist Council of National Liberation consisting of all parties and nationalities in Yugoslavia formed at Bihach.

1943

- January 18*—Siege of Leningrad lifted.
- January 31*—Final liquidation of Nazi forces trapped at Stalingrad.
- April 27*—U.S.S.R. breaks with the reactionary Polish emigre government in London.
- May 14*—North Africa cleared of Fascist Armies.
- June 3*—Giraud and de Gaulle achieve unity in the French Committee of National Liberation.

June 10—Dissolution of the Communist International.
July 10—Allies land in Sicily.
July 12—National Committee of "Free Germany" formed in Moscow.
July 24—Hitler's Kursk offensive smashed. The turn of the tide.
July 25—Fall of Mussolini.
September 3—British forces land in Italy.
September 8—Unconditional surrender by Badoglio Government.
October 30—U.S.S.R., U.S.A., Britain and China in Moscow Conference lay down principles for "broad system of international co-operation and security."
November 20—Popular demonstrations all over Britain against release of Mosley, leader of British Fascists.
November 24—Lebanon crisis solved.
December 1—Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill issue joint declaration from Teheran.
December 4—Formation of Provisional National Government in liberated Yugoslavia representing all parties and nationalities, headed by Marshal Tito.
December 12—U.S.S.R. signs treaty of friendship with Czechoslovakia.

1944

January 5—Red Army crosses 1939 frontiers of the U.S.S.R.
January 27—Mrs. Naidu repudiates sabotage as Congress programme.
January 28—Five Italian parties unite to form National Front of Liberation at Bari.
February 1—Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. hands over control over Defence and Foreign Affairs to Union Republics.
~~March 10~~ *March 10*—All-Parties' Committee of National Liberation formed in Greece.
March 23—Japanese forces cross Indian frontier.
March 31—Soviet-Japanese agreement withdrawing Japanese oil and coal concessions in Sakhalin Islands, and certain fishing rights.
~~April 4~~ *April 4*—Communists join French Committee of National Liberation.
April 21—Formation of All-Parties' cabinet in liberated Italy,

including the National Front.

May 6—Mahatma Gandhi released from detention.

May 12—Red Army liberates Sebastopol.

May 21—Greek all-parties' conference meeting in Lebanon agrees on 8-point programme and is recognised by Greek Government in Cairo.

June 4—Allied armies liberate Rome.

June 6—Allied Expeditionary Forces land in France.

June 8—New all-parties' cabinet formed in Italy, without Badoglio, following abdication of Victor Emmanuel.

